

The University of Chicago
Libraries



*Am. American Journal
of Theology*

RACE AND RELIGION.

RACE AND RELIGION

Hellenistic Theology : Its Place in Christian Thought.

BY

THOMAS ALLIN, D.D.,

"

Author of "*Universalism asserted as the Hope of the Gospel*" (7th Ed.);
"*Redemption; its true extent as taught in Holy Scripture.*"

Via prima salutis
Quod minime reris, Graiâ pandetur ab urbe.
VIRG. ÆN. VI. 97.

London :

JAMES CLARKE & CO., 13 & 14, FLEET STREET.

—
1899.

BT 22
A 43

Dir.
At. Comd.
Jous. The

128512
chg

LETTER.

DEAR MR. ALLIN,

I have read with the greatest interest the proof sheets of your work on Hellenism which you kindly sent me.

Many convinced members of the Church of England are unaware of the existence, from the earliest times, of a type of Christianity which conceives of God as the Responsible Parent-source, immanent in the Universe; and which regards the Incarnation not as an expedient to remedy a marred plan, but as the climax of an eternal purpose "before the foundation of the world."

I consider that the careful study, the vigorous exposition, the earnest thought, which characterise your volume are calculated to bring conviction and consolation to Anglicans of this type, and constitute a valuable contribution towards that wholesome reaction from the narrow limits of

01410

Augustinian theology to the depth and optimism of the noble thoughts of Clement and Athanasius, which is more and more perceptible in the religious thought of the age.

I wish your volume, in the highest sense, abundant success.

I am, sincerely yours,

BASIL WILBERFORCE.

20, Dean's Yard, Westminster Abbey.

October, 1899.

PREFACE.

It is the special good fortune of Hellenism that it appeals at once to the Liberal and to the Conservative; to the latter because it is the most ancient and venerable statement of Christian teaching which we possess; to the former because of its remarkable anticipation of much that seems modern in the religious thought of to-day.

Hardly a year passes without the publication of some book which startles the Conservative by its apparent novelty; and yet the seemingly strange doctrine is often one which, to the early Hellenist, was a commonplace. (That which seems revolutionary is, in fact, hardly more than a reversion to primitive models.

* * * *

In the thought of Hellenism a profound unity underlies all phenomena, and works steadily and surely towards the elimination

of all discord and evil. This purpose, viz., "The Restoration of All Things," is clearly revealed in Holy Scripture; this larger Hope or Certainty is indeed "The glad tidings of great joy" which the Gospel promises.

The agent in this process is the Immanent Logos manifested in the flesh, made man for us and for our salvation. But as the universe is really ONE, the work of the Logos cannot be confined to this earth; it extends to the entire spiritual world, and is effective wherever the *logical*, i.e., rational, creature sins and suffers.

The Incarnation is thus the expression of a universal purpose of unification, education, restoration.

This plan may be traced in all God's dealings with us. His wrath and vengeance are really the expression of love eternal. Fire, penalty, judgment are but moments in the great *redemptive* process. The Resurrection is its climax.

* * * *

In the Hellenistic vocabulary, such Western phrases as imputation, satisfaction, substitution, probation, are wanting; sin, however grievous, is always curable,

because residing in the will, and not penetrating to the nature of man.

While the ties of heredity are recognised, yet infant innocence is firmly held. The Church, if not technically, is yet potentially and vitally a synonym for the whole human family.

The crude absolutism which has always characterised the Latin ideal of God, and which is reflected in the claims of the Pope, as God's vicegerent, is also wanting in Hellenistic theology.

This indeed recognised the Divine sovereignty, but it is the supremacy of a reasonable and loving Creator and Parent.

To man a special interest and dignity is assigned, stamped as he is indelibly with the Divine image, a child of the All Father, a pupil whom the Heavenly Tutor is educating. But man is more than this. He is the microcosm or mirror of the universe, God's representative and vicegerent, a common bond and centre uniting the spiritual and sensible universe.

* * * *

These doctrines contrast profoundly with our traditional Western Creed. They require a new philosophy (which is yet the

oldest) of God and man. They involve a new diagnosis of sin and a new estimate of redemption.

I do not for a moment pretend that the above sketch contains anything more than the barest outline of the Hellenistic standpoint—drawn broadly, perhaps even roughly. I hope it may be sufficient to induce some students to reconsider their adherence to that theology still largely current among us, which, historically viewed, is little better than a broken-down Carthaginianism — an Augustinianism largely disintegrated, and disguised with a motley array of patches, that it may if possible bear some resemblance to those “GLAD TIDINGS” in which Latinism has never really believed.

Western divines have, and no doubt sincerely, professed to teach the Gospel, but their genuine message has been the deliverance of only a portion of the human family, and a final dualism where sin, and pain, and woe, are for ever triumphant.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. Introductory	1
II. Hellenism	17
III. Semitism (Latinism)	63
IV. Latinism	75
V. Summary and Conclusion	125

INTRODUCTORY.

INTRODUCTORY.

IN the science of Astronomy, research often shows that what to the ordinary observer seems a single star is really double, and can be resolved into two distinct bodies, revolving each in a separate orbit.

In our traditional creed a similar phenomenon presents itself. The theology of the Early Patristic Era, generally believed to be one and uniform, may by an examination of the writers themselves be easily resolved into two distinct systems, whose divergencies are not alone real, but often fundamental.

To show the reality and importance of the distinction between Latinism and Hellenism, to trace back this divergence to its roots in racial tendencies, and to show its vital bearing on the religious problems of the day, is the object of the following chapters.

Fresh points of interest are discovered as we proceed in our investigation of early Christian thought.

We learn that the familiar phrase "the Fathers" conveys a real if unconscious *suppressio veri*.

The moral difficulties that each year render the acceptance of many traditional doctrines more difficult are seen to belong to Latin theology.

They can in the great majority of cases be traced to their sources in Latin instincts, tendencies, and modes of thought which seem inherent in the type and are far older than Christianity.

On the other hand, a welcome discovery is made—viz., that not a little of what is supposed to be modern in religious thought is really the most ancient and venerable of all, and represents, at least in its principle, the primary conviction of thinkers who stand immeasurably above the Latins, with very few exceptions, of the first four centuries.

Two facts should be noticed further.

This Hellenistic theology is not the product of controversy; it belongs to the pre-controversial age, it is the spontaneous expression of the earliest Christian thought; its *spirit* long remained unaffected by the many struggles of rival churches and schools on the battleground of the Trinitarian (and similar) dogmas. The reasons of its decline and fall I have attempted to explain in the last chapter of this book.

Again, the Hellenists enjoyed the unique advantage of reading the New Testament in the original as their native tongue—a most significant fact when we compare their energetic and far-reaching optimism with the Latin pessimists; especially significant when we still hear the confident assertion repeated that, let Sentimentalists and Rationalists argue as they please, at least it remains certain that the New Testament holds out no hope of future restoration to those who have died in sin.

Into the question, important as it is, whether Universalism be true or false, I do not attempt to enter in these pages; that task has been essayed in another volume,* to which those interested may be referred.

But I make no apology for a passing allusion to this vast question, for it is impossible seriously to consider the early Hellenistic theology without recognising everywhere the spirit and often the letter of the very largest hope; willing or unwilling as the student may be, he is left no choice here if his work is to have any value. Indeed, the reluctance of so many divines to admit the existence of primitive theological ideals so widely differing from our current orthodoxy is an additional

* Universalism Asserted as the Hope of the Gospel. Seventh Edition. 3s. 6d. cloth, 2s. paper cover. (Williams and Norgate, London.)

reason making necessary the publication of works like the present modest essay.

And here three suggestive features of early Hellenism may be noted.

In the first place, however widely its various schools may have differed on minor points, all are broadly optimistic.

Alexandria and Antioch have their rivalries, their jealousies, their contrasted theories of exegesis; but Origen is not a more decided Universalist than the distinguished (and I may add most unfairly depreciated) Theodore of Mopsuestia, head of the Antiochene school. To these original thinkers are due the two great systems of theology which Hellenism has bequeathed to the Church, which by divergent paths reach the same goal and echo with confidence the same views as to human destiny, as to the extent and the universal success finally of the Divine plan of redemption. The remarkable group of Cappadocian Fathers, all of them, I incline to think—certainly most of them—accept the same doctrine.

This brings us to the close of the great fourth century, the flowering period of primitive theology, which is permeated by these doctrines. As Doederlin remarks (*Instit. Theol.*): “In proportion to the eminence of any Christian teacher was the conviction with which he asserted the termination of penalties at some time in

the future." If space permitted I might add not a few similar testimonies to the diffusion of the larger hope at this date.

And in the second place, it is right to point out that such views are, as a rule, stated without fear or reticence, without the least notion of any unsoundness, but rather as part of the Faith. Thus Gregory of Nyssa proclaims them aloud, not in one treatise but in many; and Gregory died not alone in the odour of sanctity, but as probably the foremost thinker and divine of the Church of his day.

The third point deserving of notice is the extreme breadth of view of many early Hellenists. They are not Universalists merely, as we use the term, but they extend the area of restoration so widely that it finally covers the whole universe and embraces all spiritual beings—all *who share* the logical, *i.e.*, reasonable nature of the Logos.

Imperfect as these pages are (as I feel but too well), their imperfection is enhanced because, owing to causes (which are private and personal), I have been unable to print the evidence which the works of the various Greek and Latin Fathers afford abundantly, in proof of the propositions advanced. These chapters form, in a word, but a part of a larger whole,* as projected,

* Perhaps I may state that some of the needful evidence may be found in the volume above mentioned in the notes.

dealing with the various Hellenistic schools in detail and with many Latins—especially Augustine—and illustrated by ample quotations.

* * * *

It may be admitted that, with certain exceptions, there has been a general unwillingness to recognise the divergence of Latin and Hellenistic theology. For this failure there exist two reasons, one general, one special.

i. Theology has been essentially a conservative science ; its favourite pace has been to move at *petite vitesse*. Theologians have been unwilling to raise troublesome questions by which doubt might fall on traditions grown venerable and accepted with practical unanimity.

Thus eyes have been judiciously closed, and facts, half consciously, half unconsciously, minimised or evaded or “*adapted*.”

ii. A further special reason exists in the fact that we all are Latins ; we see with Latin eyes and hear with Latin ears. The African or Augustinian version of the Gospel comes to us in familiar guise. Westerns all of us, why should we dethrone a Western formula ?

As the Latin poet sings—

Nescio quâ natale solum dulcedine cunctos
Ducit, et immemores non sinit esse sui.

We refuse to hear the charmer, “charm

he never so wisely," who does not speak in a Western tongue.

Immersed in our Western traditions, we remain provincials rather than Catholics. We are Latin even in our revolt against Rome.* Latin modes of thought dominate even such creeds as Lutheranism and Calvinism.

Even one like Byron, outside the Christian pale, feels the Latin spell, and cries—

O Rome, my country ! City of my soul !

* * * *

Wrapped from our infancy in Latin forms, we persist in dressing up the past in the wardrobe of to-day. If a village painter depict the Prodigal Son in the garb of the young squire we smile, and proceed to do much the same ourselves.

The rustic artist is but transferring his surroundings to the Past. He transfers to the times of Jesus Christ the costume of his contemporaries. We are doing in principle the same thing when we ascribe to the men of Alexandria or of Antioch the mental wardrobe of Carthage or of Rome which has come down to us, when we persist in dressing up the primitive Hellenists in the spiritual garments of the nineteenth century.

* * * *

Again, the limits of space oblige me to

* Dean Milman's distinction of Teutonic from Latin Christianity is superficial, and not essentially true.

pass lightly over many points, but in order to avoid misconceptions of the meaning of Hellenism, some very brief notice is needful of two words which sum up roughly but effectually two great and still living controversies. These are "Rationalism" and "Liberalism." Both have in process of time acquired—especially the former—undesirable connotations. And yet, sooth to say, both are in a very real sense marks of Hellenism. The Hellenist rendered allegiance to the Eternal Reason (*i.e.*, Logos), which became incarnate in the man Jesus.

In this sense he was a Rationalist—exactly because he was a Christian. Reason was to him something Divine, the judge and arbiter of controversies. Men like Plato were divinely guided and inspired.

Turning next to Liberalism, here the irony of time is complete. To men like Newman, "Liberalism" seemed a very instrument of Satan. Against "Liberalism" were arrayed the forces of the Tractarian movement.

And yet it is certain historically that the Gospel first grew into a theology at Alexandria under auspices which must be called "liberal."

Certain it is that "Liberalism" guided the thought of this most primitive and famous of Christian schools.

Not less certain is it that the greatest of early Christian "Liberals," Origen, marks an epoch at once in textual criticism, in Biblical exegesis, in Christology, and in Apologetics.

Nay, in this same general "liberal" tendency, Alexandria stands side by side with Cappadocia, with Cesarea, with Antioch, with not a few scattered Hellenistic thinkers (who belong to no special school).

* * * *

To originality I lay little claim in these pages (I have borrowed widely), content to be useful if I may; content to gather from all available sources facts and illustrations of Latinism and Hellenism. It may be a humble *rôle* to group and classify what is more or less familiar to students of history.* But the significance of even familiar things is often missed, and the weight and importance of the accumulated facts is unnoticed, especially so where, as here, not a few subtle influences are steadily at work to hinder unwelcome conclusions from being drawn, and to minimise such inferences as are inevitable.

* * * *

It may be that the connection between persistent racial tendencies and subsequent

* Yet even Mr. Lecky seems unaware of the doctrines of Hellenistic theology.

theological developments is more clearly indicated in these pages than in other more ambitious volumes. If I have not succeeded here, then it is much to be desired that a more competent pen should essay the task—should trace the connection more ably, should marshal the facts more skilfully, and enable us in many a traditional doctrine or valued shibboleth to detect some racial tendency—to see the spirit of ancient Carthage or of Rome rather than of Jesus Christ.

* * * *

Doubtless there is a danger—which I have tried to avoid—of falling into a kind of theological quackery—of exalting Hellenism to the rank of a spiritual panacea, and treating the adherents of Latinism as dupes or worse.

To the faults of Hellenism we need not be blind, nor to the merits of its rival. And yet to many disheartened students a Land of Promise seems to open in the fields of Hellenism.

Here is, or seems to be, “an ampler ether,” “a diviner air.” Here are great principles affirmed to which Latinism has opposed a steady negative, and great ideals held out. Here, too, may be found the germ—the spirit, if not the letter—of much that is best in modern theological thought. Here, too, is the goal indicated towards which that thought is travelling.

There is yet a point of some interest to which in closing I may advert. We learn as we discuss Latinism and Hellenism that not in formal creed or symbol lie the most vital of all spiritual issues. The watershed is elsewhere; the "great divide," if I may borrow a convenient phrase, does not turn on these questions. Latin and Hellenist accepted the Nicene symbol as authoritative, and practically adhered to the same standards. And yet who shall easily measure the distance ethically and spiritually between Alexandria and Carthage, between an Origen and an Augustine?

Not that I share the common (and may I add superficial?) depreciation of dogma. Plausible it may be, but it is only that; for a world-wide faith like Christianity must have definite doctrines, and these in turn must be capable of more or less clear statement. Jesus Christ left behind Him an army, not a mob. But soldiers without authority, discipline, watchwords, marching orders, would be a rabble, not an army.

Yet true as the foregoing is, the deepest spiritual issues are those which no creed formulates, which lie beyond—perhaps above—the region of dogma, beyond also the Lutheran test of the *cadentis* or *stantis ecclesiæ*, which the intellect cannot solve, nor the Higher Criticism illuminate.

Important as it may be to learn all that can be discovered of the nature and per-

sonality of God, and of that mode of His relation to man which we call the Incarnation, it is more important to understand aright His character, to be persuaded, not so much that He is almighty as that He is good—as men call goodness. Theologians have been so often blind to these primary questions that we need not affect to wonder at the contempt poured on Theology itself (illogical though it may be)* in an age like ours dominated increasingly by moral ideals.

A final word to critics, and I have done. Nowadays many a reviewer dissects a book microscope in hand—a literary pathologist, eager to detect a slip, an error in date, or name, or place; never so happy as when he can point to a fault, and so hold up the author to scorn as incapable and unworthy of credit.

Criticism I heartily welcome, but not of this sort. I have not so learned the true critic's part.

* An objection frequently, but I think unfairly, made, may be noticed in passing. It is a favourite with writers of the "superior" type, and it consists in allusions half contemptuous, half amused, to a current sentimentality which refuses to believe in the stern facts of sin and retribution. But the objector forgets that this refusal to believe is due not to modern Liberalism, but to traditional exaggeration. It lies at the door of traditionalists, who piled agony on agony till the inevitable reaction came. But in retribution stern and inevitable all the great Hellenists believe.

Let the points that are of weight be fairly stated ; let the essential be severed from the trivial ; let a spirit of equity prevail everywhere. On such conditions let issue be fairly joined.

To say that this little volume has many faults is needless—it is like preaching to one already converted. In a field so wide as that which it discusses mistakes may occur. And yet, however keen may be my sense of defects, by true and fair criticism I am ready to be judged.



HELLENISM.



HELLENISM.

So great a part has been played by Hellenism in the field of theology that I must devote some space to an account of the Greek race—its origin and characteristics.

Ten centuries or more* before Christ, but later than the Phœnicians, we find Greeks trading, warring, colonising among the isles of the *Ægean* and the adjacent coasts.

On the Mediterranean shores of France and Spain there was also a thin sprinkling of their colonies, as on the Dalmatian coasts and islands; probably even on the *Euxine*.

More influential than the colonising tendency in spreading Hellenism was the splendid career of Alexander.

His conquests and the numerous cities—not less than seventy—which he founded brought Hellenism into close contact with Oriental civilisation, and made it a power practically world-wide.

* Some writers adopt an earlier date,

The enterprise of the Macedonian and his successors had leavened more or less completely with Hellenism, Parthia, Persia, Assyria, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, Lydia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Bithynia, Palestine, &c. Nor was Africa forgotten; Egypt was Hellenised; Alexandria succeeded Athens as the intellectual metropolis of the world. The breaking up of Alexander's empire which followed his death was like the breaking of the box which permits the perfume and ointment to escape. Hellenism became even more cosmopolitan.

It touched and revolutionised Jewish thought; in its language Christianity first spoke to the world.

When the fulness of time had come and Christianity was born, it found Hellenism the predominant spiritual and intellectual force—an empire within the Roman Empire; and it found Greek, not alone as the intellectual tongue, but as a sort of *lingua franca*, current everywhere.

We, as a rule, accept the fact, but fail to see its significance, that Christianity, Semitic in its root, should not have employed a Semitic language; that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, should have spoken Greek; that all the Gospels probably, and all the Epistles certainly, were written in Greek; that a Hebrew of the Hebrews like St. Paul and a Roman citizen should

not have left to the Church so much as a line in Hebrew or in Latin. Both were rejected.

The first recorded evangelistic journeys mainly followed the course of Greek culture. The first and greatest of Christian missionaries went by preference to cities which were centres of Greek civilisation—to Antioch, to Ephesus, to Corinth, &c. Christianity was born in an empire wholly Roman, with Roman laws, Roman institutions, Roman supremacy, Roman roads, the *pax Romana*, yet the Roman language was deliberately passed by. The significance of this rests on the fact that language is sacramental—it is the visible sign of an inward spiritual force. When Greek became the official language of the Gospel far more is meant than at first appears. “Though Christianity,” says Heine, “with a true Christian patience tormented itself for more than a thousand years to spiritualise the Latin tongue, its efforts remained fruitless. It is a language of command for generals, a language of decree for administrators, an attorney language for usurers, a lapidary speech for the stone-hard Latin race.”

It is not that the early Hellenistic theologians reject the distinctive Latin dogmas; they do better—they ignore them. Silence on such points is more eloquent than any disclaimer.

The weight of such facts is only duly estimated if we remember the commanding position occupied by Hellenistic theology in the early centuries. Up to Leo no Roman Bishop had made any important contribution to theology. They were simply nobodies. The main current of primitive theology outside the North African school flowed for nearly four hundred years in Hellenistic channels, and was the work of Hellenistic minds. The vast Trinitarian question was settled by the East which had raised it. The great Christological controversies were all Eastern, the early Councils Eastern, the greatest schools of theology Eastern; out of the five Patriarchates, four are Eastern; out of some eleven hundred bishops present at the first six General Councils, all but a very tiny fraction were Eastern.

Greeks, not Latins, founded the homily, founded exegesis of Scripture, founded ecclesiastical history, founded textual criticism. The Old Testament never spoke to the world till it was translated into Greek.

We must to-day speak Greek when we say Bible, or Jesus, or Christ; when we speak of Church, of Litany, of Liturgy, of Clergy, of Laity, of Bishop, Priest, or Deacon; when we mention Monk, or Hermit, or Monastery, or Baptism, or Eucharist, or Hymn, or Symbol. Latin

had not even at first a term to express the Greek Σωτήρ Saviour.

And when a later age for the sake of symmetry set up four Latin Doctors side by side with four Greeks, the attempt only revealed the sterility of the Latin Church theologically.

Of the four Latin Doctors the one original thinker was Augustine. Jerome is distinguished as the founder of Ecclesiastical Latinity, the greatest textual critic and translator of the Early Church. When at his best he is probably the greatest master of style among the Latin Fathers.

But his theology was borrowed from Origen and the Hellenists; and the taunt which he flung at Ambrose, that he struts in borrowed plumage, goes much deeper than Jerome meant. The scoff recoils on the scoffer.

Yet if St. Ambrose be no great theologian, he is a great ruler; a statesman, if not a thinker; a great character, if not a great intellect.

Gregory, latest and least of the four, owes his rank as Doctor not to any powers of original thought, of which he had little, but to his services in founding what may be termed Mediævalism—*e.g.*, in developing the purgatorial system, cult of relics, ritual, &c. As theologian he is distinctly inferior at once to Pope Leo and to Hilary; but the Western Church, with an

instinct quite intelligible, rewarded his services with ampler honours than theirs.

If, then, any one had in the third or fourth Christian century surveyed the Roman world, he would have seen in the West practically a single Latin school, centred at Carthage, extending over North Africa, the East of Spain, and parts of the Latin peninsula; while confronting this was a vast Hellenistic organisation comprising several schools,* spreading not alone over the whole Eastern Church, with its many seats of learning, but forming also the preponderating element in Italy and Gaul, at least in the greatest teachers.

Of the Hellenistic schools the most important and original are those of Antioch, of Alexandria, and of Cappadocia.

The school and library founded by

* To prevent misapprehension, my readers must remember that this word "school" has two senses—in the wider one it stands for a certain type of thought, a set of related opinions; in the narrower sense it denotes a teaching faculty, a quasi-University. Sometimes, as in the case of Alexandria, both senses are applicable to the same place; sometimes one only; the latter is the more frequent usage. Thus, by the school of Cappadocia is meant that dogmatic type characterising the three great Cappadocian teachers (the two Gregories and Basil); by the school of Carthage is meant its special type of doctrine. Again, let us note that, *as a rule*, in these pages Eastern does not mean Oriental, but rather Hellenistic—*i.e.*, it stands as equivalent to that Greek type of thought which had passed into the East either by colonisation or by conquest.

Origen at the Palestinian Cesarea has produced few names of note, and is hardly more than an echo of Alexandria. Besides these schools there were not a few less or more coherent groups, and many isolated teachers, all under Hellenistic influences, and conforming to the same general type.

In the Eastern Church, unlike the Western, it is the new cities, the colonies—that are distinguished theologically. It is not Athens, not Jerusalem, not Damascus, but Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Cesarea, that stand in the front rank theologically.

What then is Hellenism? It is not, I reply, a degenerate Byzantinism, such as has prevailed in the East very widely since about the sixth century; nor is it the special teaching of any one school (as many to-day believe): *it is a type of thought common to them all* during the four earliest centuries. It is not a mere philosophy, it is a certain *ethos*, which has its roots in the past and is anchored there, which reflects and sums up national character and instincts of race.

The final separation of East and West was but the widening of “the little rift within the lute” which had always existed.

Therefore, if we would understand Hellenism in its Christian aspects, we must go back. No arbitrary line severs the Hel-

lenist of Alexandria or Cappadocia from his past.

We must look at the antecedents historically, psychologically, even physically.

To a unique race like the Greeks, Nature allotted a unique home; Greece lies at the meeting of the ways. More than half an island, a bridge linking East and West, its place is at that extremity of the Mediterranean where Asia and Europe touch. Nature has thus seemed to mark out this people as at once the heir of the Old World and the interpreter of its thought to new races.

The Mediterranean at its eastern extremity is a natural centre of civilisation.*

Hardly less unique than the position of Greece is its configuration. Perhaps no other land has so vast a coast-line, has shores so seamed and fretted with bays,

* The axes of civilisation, says E. Reclus, in the western extremity of Asia converge upon the basin of the Hellenic Mediterranean. The long fissure of the Red Sea points directly toward the Eastern Mediterranean; the winding valley of the Nile opens in the same direction; the Persian Gulf continued to the north-west by the Euphrates runs toward that angle of the Mediterranean where is Cyprus; further north all the rivers, all the highways of commerce which descend from Asia Minor, from the continent of Asia, from the Sarmatian plains to the Black Sea, become tributaries of the Greek waters through the Bosphorus and Hellespont.—*Contemporary Review*, October, 1894.

has seas so covered with clustering isles.

Mountain ranges occupy nearly nine-tenths of the country's surface, ensuring the isolation of each tribe, and, by rendering communication difficult, fostering individualism and love of liberty.

Narrow valleys or elevated slopes, with here and there a fertile plain, are all that remain for tillage. Greece is thus a sort of Venice and Switzerland in one. Like the former, its empire is colonial, and won on the seas; like the latter, it is really an aggregate of cantons rather than States. In its palmy days Athens could hardly have possessed more than 25,000 full citizens.

Attica is little more than a narrow ledge between the ocean and the mountains, and stands "one foot on sea and one on land."

Indeed, we should hardly err in calling Greece itself an island, an assemblage of mountain peaks, with intervening valleys and small plains rising out of the deep, and pierced everywhere with inlets.

In climate there are few extremes—everything points to moderation, and tends to cheerfulness and light; in this favoured land the natural phenomena that appal the senses are rare or absent.

Smooth waters and sunny seas, with abundant havens, rendered easy and attractive that maritime life which a dry and

scanty soil made a necessity to the Greeks. At their door lay clustering islets; while beyond these, three continents invited to settlement or conquest. With wealth thus easily won comes leisure, and with leisure a culture which under such circumstances tends to be eclectic rather than narrow and provincial.

Thus, too, the Greeks became wanderers, and perhaps to no ancient people is it more difficult to assign precise boundaries than to them. Hellas is a race rather than merely a country.

Thus, at the outset, the contrast is marked between the Hellene and the Semite and Roman, at once physically, politically, and, I may add, religiously.

“Rome, seated in the midst of a circle of extinct volcanoes, enclosed again by the greater circle of the Appennines, first consolidated herself within this double rampart, and then extended her sway over the Mediterranean.”*

No sunny bays invited her sailors to trade, few neighbouring islets tempted her navies to conquest.

Centralisation is the fact most deeply impressed on early Roman history, as Separatism is that written on early Hellenism. These characters have been persistent to this day; the Greek Church is without a centre, while the Latin

* E. Reclus.

is doubly centred in a place and in a man.

This "separatism" of the Hellene was at the same time his strength and his weakness—his strength, for thus Hellenism became a leaven working everywhere; his weakness, for politically Hellenism was unstable and evanescent. The Hellene was centrifugal, while the Roman was centripetal. To the Greek each city was a State, and each State a city, a fact still surviving in our word "politics." Brilliant, plastic, adventurous, the Greeks wanted coherence.* Alexander's vast empire fell to pieces as rapidly as it rose. So, too, theologically Hellenism was shortlived, its organised stage was brief; the thought lingers, the leaven remains, the edifice has perished; the theology of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Cappadocia has been evanescent.

The Roman, unlike the Hellene, from the first was seeking to weld into one whole and to subdue all the neighbouring tribes; while in the Greek peninsula dwelt an aggregate of many independent communities, each preserving its own laws, manners, institutions, united by a common name, a common language, and practically

* Sea powers seem to lack stability. Greece fell, so did Carthage, so in later days did Venice, and Genoa, and Pisa; a remarkable exception is England—so far!

a common faith. The tie in the former case (that of Rome) was largely material, here it was spiritual.

The Amphictyonic bond clasped all Hellenes; in the Olympic games and Olympic deities—specially in the Delphic Oracle—they had a common centre.

The Greek union was literary, artistic, spiritual in a word; a common language and common faith united them, leaving each State to its own free development. In all Greece there never was anything at all resembling the definite centre which Rome, the Eternal City, furnished to the Latins and forms still.

Here the Hellene is distinguished, not alone from the Latin, but from the Oriental.

While Buddhism has one great name and Hebraism one Great Founder, the Persian faith one and the Chinese one great teacher, the Hellene had many wise men, who with equal fame taught in centres widely apart.

Almost all the famous pre-Socratic schools of philosophy were colonial. At Miletus, at Ephesus, at Abdera, at Agrigentum, Clazomene, Samos, Elea, were centres of research or birthplaces of great thinkers centuries before the blossoming of Athenian wisdom.

It is interesting to trace the same tendency in Hellenistic theology, which had

not one but many centres: the various schools of theology are the Christian counterpart of the earlier philosophic centres.

The attitude of the Hellenistic mind at once towards Law and Unity is worth our consideration. They lacked the legal instinct of the Roman, and yet to their thinkers is due the idea that Nature is working by fixed rules—that the reign of law is everywhere.

Speculatively, they were stronger and profounder; practically, they were weaker than the Latins in their conception of law, and in their power to apply it in daily life.

And so with the kindred question of Unity. That a spiritual unity lay behind and directed all phenomena was deeply felt by the Hellenes. To this their language bears witness; this it has expressed in a term, so apt that it has passed unchanged into many tongues. To the Greek the "Kosmos" is the visible sign of an invisible order and unity. It is the mould into which the divine thought has flowed.

But their individualism led them to disregard external unity—unlike the Romans, who almost deified the State—a distinction which has passed into and vitally affected theology. When one of the earlier Tractarians, Mr. Palmer, appealed to the East, he could not find any response to the

Western idea of the Church* and its claims.

There were excellent reasons for this seeming indecision. The Church is, if we follow the inner bent and meaning of Hellenism, an essentially spiritual body, potentially co-extensive with the whole race of man because Christ is at once Head of the Church and Head of all humanity.† But if this be so, it is impossible to limit the Church to any external organisation, however venerable or even apostolic. It is impossible not to recognise, if not formally yet indirectly, as fellow-Churchmen, no less than fellow-Christians, all in whose life the Spirit of Christ is working.

If the greatest spiritual fact in ancient story be the development of Judaism—with its complement Christianity—from a Semitic basis, certainly the second greatest is the genesis of Hellenism. Its startling originality of type can only be felt when we set it against the background of Eastern faiths which were its neighbours.

* Indeed, on the question of the Church and its essential constitution there has never been any definite and final decision in the East. St. John Damascene, in his authoritative statement of the orthodox faith, has assigned no particular place to the Church.

† When, then, Origen says there is no salvation outside the Church; and Clement calls the Church the body of the Lord, they used the words in no Latin sense. Elsewhere Origen assures us that all true believers are as Peter—are living stones.

Over Egypt brooded an ancient civilisation, 2,000 to 3,000 years old when Homer wrote. Egyptian life lay buried, so to speak, beneath an organised sacerdotalism—a complex and stereotyped ritual—an elaborate cult of the dead and a quasi-divine kingship. An “otherworldliness” more complete than in any other country weighed down the life of the people and controlled their thoughts.

Even more striking, perhaps, is the contrast Hellenism offers to the great Semitic civilisations, with their organised secular despotism, their pitiless gods, their cruel punishments.

Amid such influences, such examples, such teaching, there rose this people—Oriental in its root, yet an emphatic negation of all that was Oriental; where that was sacerdotal, this was lay; while that was rigid, this was elastic.

While the Semitic empires were under a despotic rule, the Hellenes were free politically; while they flung living babes into the fiery arms of Moloch, these worshipped the radiant Apollo. Stranger still is this originality when we remember how close the contact was of Egyptian, Phœnician, and Oriental with the Greeks. Semitic deities, *e.g.*, Artemis, Aphrodite, Hercules, appear in Greek mythology. Eastern sages probably inspired Hellenistic thinkers. Phœnician mariners for centuries sailed

the same seas as the Hellenes, colonised the same shores, traded to the same ports. The Greeks borrowed from Egypt and from the East without losing a trace of their distinctive standpoint. The closer its tie to both, the more striking is the originality of Hellenism.

We thus learn that however important may be physical antecedents they are not all. The origin of race remains an ultimate fact defying a complete analysis.

Why the sunny shores of the *Ægean* and its fairy isles should have roused in the Greek the love of beauty and fed the artistic sense, and yet have stirred no similar pulse in the Tyrian mariner, no one can explain; it remains one of Nature's secrets—that subtle alchemy, by which out of materials largely the same she develops race and racial distinctions and antagonisms, which are persistent, which, indeed, form the soil yielding the intellectual and spiritual harvest we are reaping to-day.

Unlike the majority of early races, the Hellenes had no sacerdotal caste, no religious books, no sacred law. Yet in Homer and Hesiod we have a rude sort of Old Testament, they are the earliest Greek Fathers. With Homer, European literature begins; in his pages we first meet the Hellenic aggregate, and make acquaintance with the Hellenic type. Here, I

think, the most striking fact is the unique relationship of man to God. To the Hellenes God was hardly more than Man "writ large." While the Semite trembles before his cruel deities, and even the Roman will not sacrifice except with veiled face, the Homeric chief addresses his gods erect and fearlessly—in some cases even commands and threatens them.

That this was no form of irreverence is shown by the characteristic Greek term *aidos*, hardly capable of translation, but which implies respect for what is good and holy—for rulers, for parents, for oneself. In Homer there are no evil gods; in no other poem ever written was the relation of man to God so close and yet so free and fearless. No self-mutilation marked any Greek faith. No race highly civilised was so little sacerdotal as the Greek. In Homer the priest has, indeed, honour, but little influence. The Greek was first a man and then a priest; the Oriental first a priest, or a despot, and then a man.

There is justice in the praise awarded to family life in old Rome—to its purity and self-restraint; but we must remember that here, too, Roman hardness was felt. The wife was only *res*—i.e., a chattel over whom the husband had power of life and death; and the son was virtually a slave. In the Odyssey, on the other hand, there are scenes of domestic life as pure

and true, and far more tender, than Rome can show.

Take, *e.g.*, the relations of Laertes and Eurytheia, and the story of Ulysses and Alcinous. Perhaps no picture of girl-life so charming as that of Nausicaa can be found in primitive literature, except it be that of Ruth.

Family love is emphasized and praised. All strangers come from Jove. Hands stained with blood are deemed unworthy to join in worship; poisoned arrows are plainly disapproved. When Lykaon offered a child in sacrifice to Zeus he is changed into a wolf. Ulysses forbids exultation over the slain suitors.

Ulysses, as no other hero, illustrates the many-sidedness of the Hellenic character. He is a "compound of many simples"—love of home and love of travel, a primitive Tory and yet a Radical, a rudimentary philosopher. He is fighter and politician at once—has the strength that alone can bend the great bow and the wit to cozen Polyphemus. His love of travel and his delight in exploration make him almost one of ourselves. In the tale of his adventures are scenes as perennially fresh and human as the story of Joseph and his brethren, or of Rebecca and Isaac. And as the relation of man to God is free and unembarrassed, so is that of man to man. The Homeric monarchy is not absolute;

the people are honoured, and their consent asked in the assembly. The sceptre is borne by heralds and priests as well as by kings. The prince is bound to respect his subjects' rights.

Greek dislike of tyranny from the first is shown by a speech which Herodotus (about 500 B.C.) attributes to Sosicles. Nor does a single instance of an aristocracy pure and simple occur in any Greek state—not even at Sparta.

In Homer, destiny is indeed recognised, but has no cult. A strong clear sense of right and wrong is shown; the very keynote of Achilles' character is a burning sense of injustice. In later times the Greeks had a special term *misoponeros*, which denotes hate of evil, or of the evil man; I am not aware of any similar Latin word.

In Hesiod's "Works and Days," we have a sort of Greek Book of Proverbs, with a pure morality.

Two points to which Hesiod refers, which reappear in spirit in Hellenistic theology, may be noted. Justice is always stronger than injustice finally. The weak have a special claim, most of all the orphan.

Quite true is it that Hellenism developed since the days of Homer and Hesiod, nor were the changes uniformly for the better (while the *ruling ideas* are little altered).

Certain forms of vice become painfully prominent in later Hellenism, and the position of women at Athens is hardly so good as that described in the Homeric poems. On other points there is decided progress. Human sacrifices, of which Homer preserves some faint traces, have almost ceased everywhere in Greece; there is a deeper humanitarianism, a broader sense of human dignity, a gentler treatment of slaves.

For the idea of Fatalism, which lingers in all ancient religions, a sense of responsibility has been substituted. Nemesis ceases to be arbitrary, it is the guilty who suffer. The undertone (says Jebb) of vengeance heard in Æschylus seems in Sophocles to pass away into an echo of Divine compassion. By a striking change (and on Attic soil), the *Erinnyes* become *Eumenides*.

The contrast which the above facts and others which I proceed to notice offer to Latinism cannot fail to strike all students.

From the first there are indications in Hellenism of that sympathetic spirit which made of the Hellenes a great missionary race "apt to teach." This people, in fact, did the thinking of the whole West.

To-day, when we speak of astronomy, of mathematics, of music, arithmetic, logic, philosophy, geometry, of poets and poetry, we are using Greek words.

I have no wish to draw a one-sided picture; to credit the Greeks with modern ideals of mercy and tenderness would be absurd. In all races the observer can find faults and flaws in abundance; Greek defects are palpable. The Greek cities were often tumultuous and unruly. Even Athens wholly failed to govern itself when permitted by the Romans; a sense of order was wanting; the Greek chattered and speculated while the Roman organised. They were too quick-witted, too restless to submit to needful discipline.

Wars on a small scale were incessant in Greece; mutual jealousies abounded. In a sensitive race like the Greeks there were occasional outbursts of ferocity. Greek profligacy was notorious; in the most brilliant period of its history the position of women at Athens was low. As in the art of government generally, so in the whole science of jurisprudence the Greeks fell conspicuously behind the Romans.

In Greece, as in all ancient communities, slavery was universal, and torture was permitted in certain cases.

We are dealing, in discussing ancient Hellenism, with heathens, with a heathen civilisation, and it would be the merest vanity to expect to find those moral standards and ideals which eighteen Christian centuries have not sufficed to set up in Europe.

Nor do I seek to attenuate the impression which Greek levity, fickleness, or instability may make when contrasted with the iron rule and solid fabric of Roman dominion, or with the greater moral earnestness of Semitism in its highest forms.

I am not writing an empty eulogium of Hellenism, pagan or Christian; nor am I for a moment blind to its defects. This investigation aims at pointing out, as often stated, the co-existence of two distinct theologies in the earliest Christian centuries, and in accounting for that fact historically and racially.

It is enough if these two points be conceded—(a) the complete distinctness of the Greek type; (b) the existence in it of certain special elements which, fostered by Christianity, developed into that form of theology which distinguishes the primitive Hellenistic schools on vital points from the Latins, and which cannot be understood apart from its historical antecedents.

Yet more may and ought to be said. As we do not judge David by his lusts and murder, or Moses by his disobedience, or the Jews by their frequent idolatries, but do judge individuals and communities by their permanent factors in all similar cases, so, too, we ought to judge the Greek.

It was a true instinct which led the Greeks to dedicate their greatest church

to Sancta Sophia (Wisdom), for the race was ever seeking wisdom, and pagan Athens was specially dedicated to the goddess of wisdom.

In such hands religion became a Divine philosophy—a term which we may note as frequent in the Hellenistic Fathers, and never in the Latin, or hardly ever. Theology naturally would spring up; the relations of religious thought would be investigated, propositions would be laid down. Dogma would be formed. The race to whom we owe logic would naturally be—as, in fact, happened—the authors of creeds and symbols.

Nor can we fail to see how exactly in harmony with natural tendencies is the interesting fact that while the two earliest famous Latin books of Christian authorship deal with legal questions, *De Prescriptione* (Tertullian), or with Church authority and unity, *De Unitate* (Cyprian), the earliest Greek book which marks an epoch should discuss first principles, *De Principiis* (Origen).

The Greek love of freedom was shown by the opposition constantly offered to the tyrants, for whose rise the many cities and small states of Hellas afforded peculiar advantages.

With this sentiment of liberty we can hardly err in connecting the readiness shown, *e.g.*, at Athens, to tolerate differ-

ences of opinion. This contrasts with such institutions as the Roman censorship, by which a net was flung far and wide, in whose meshes so many details of life were caught and regulated.

It is at any rate certain that in the Greek Fathers, as contrasted with the Latin, we can trace a far freer spirit.

A Clement, an Athanasius, a Gregory of Nyssa, in their tone remind us of the greatest Attic orator whose powers were given to the advocacy of rational and ordered freedom. A sense of measure, a flexibility, a power of compromise, are distinguishing Hellenistic traits. Throughout all antiquity Greece was noted as the country where thought was freest.

Not only was there at Athens this great liberty of thought and speech, but the law gave to the citizen a protection not elsewhere enjoyed. We may, *e.g.*, note, in proof of this, the unique jury system of the Athenians, and may compare and contrast the free spirit of their law which forbade any hired advocacy with the narrow and technical Latin code.

Nor was this instinct of liberty that of the Ionians merely; even in Sparta there was little monarchical feeling, and among the Dorians generally hardly any.

We can go further, and note how the Hellenic spirit while it encouraged research, and so far would stimulate definition and

creed-making, would yet be unfriendly to all narrow dogmatising. Plato will inquire into everything; Socrates will "doubt our doubts away." The very term History is Greek, and means "Enquiry," "Questioning."

Platonism defies any rigid definition; you can easily convict its great author of inconsistencies. In much the same spirit the Greek Church to-day leaves many points open on which the West permits no doubt, *e.g.*, the Church, original sin, grace, &c. The Hellenistic mind was far less mechanical than the Latin. Thus, while Law represents a rigid bond to the latter, to the former it is a quasi-rational thing almost alive; indeed, in the *Crito* of Plato the Laws speak.

If the term be understood in a fair sense, the Hellenes were by nature Rationalists. "Know thyself," is a Greek proverb. While the Oriental mind loves twilight, one of the deepest Greek instincts underlies the famous cry, "Slay, but slay in the daylight."

In Homer Jupiter appears as counsellor—*metiates*—a view contrasting with the thundering Jupiter of the Romans.

Wit rather than strength is the mark of the Hellenic gods—a point of difference at once with Latin and Oriental.

The very deities on Olympus form a sort of Republic. Homer seizes and draws out

their shades of character as deftly as those of his human heroes.

I have said that in the Homeric poems no evil gods are known. This has its parallel, real if indirect, in Hellenistic theology—viz., in its conception of the Divine penalty as remedial, and in its denial of any anger in God.

When Isocrates tells us that it was on account of their gentleness and love of man that the gods are chiefly honoured—when Theognis says that the way to gain the evil is to do them many more kindnesses than to the good—we can almost fancy that it is the school of Alexandria which speaks to us.

Revenge is strongly condemned by Plato, who will not punish a slave in anger; moderation in punishment was the normal Hellenic idea.

Here we touch on one of the most attractive features of Hellenism, and one where the contrast with Latinism is sharp—a comparatively gentle treatment of slaves. I might easily quote a mass of evidence which tends to show that this was not Athenian merely, but was national.

No proof more satisfactory can be imagined of a unique gentleness of type than a kind treatment of slaves affords. We find Greek slaves invited to feasts with free-men; we hear Socrates bidding the master make himself loved by his slaves. We

can peruse in Xenophon a beautiful picture of a bridegroom impressing on his young wife the duty of caring for sick slaves. We can still read amusing complaints that at Athens a slave would not make way for a free man ; we can read in Plutarch the contrast between the ready chatter of the Greek slave and the Roman who only dares to speak in monosyllables.

Demosthenes says that a slave has more liberty of speech at Athens than a free citizen elsewhere.

Of this gentler type evidence from other facts exists ; some proof has been given when discussing Homer. Here I may notice the very significant contrast which the national Greek games afford to the brutal and disgusting Roman circus, where blood and cruelty were the chief attraction.

An amusing story is preserved by Polybius,* who tells how, when some Greek artists were brought to Rome, the populace took no interest in their music till, at the instigation of the lictors, they began to fight or to simulate fighting.

And when the gladiatorial games spread from Rome everywhere, they were admitted last of all into Greece ; and at Athens, when introduced, several of the best citizens left the city in indignation.

Let us pass to the parental relation.

* xxx. $\frac{1}{2}$ 14.

While at Rome it was actually more difficult to emancipate a son than a slave, and the son remained practically a chattel while his father lived—nay, might be dragged from the benches of the Senate at his father's pleasure to answer with his life for some real or supposed fault—at Athens, at an early age (eighteen years?) a son became free and independent, nor was the father permitted to disinherit his son.

The relation of the Greek colony to the parent State supplies us with further indications of the Hellenic spirit. The tie was as a rule marked by courtesy and dignity; the daughter, while claiming freedom and independence, yielded respect to the mother and acknowledged her title to assistance, or received from her a statesman or a leader in moments of enterprise or of danger. A war between the colony and the parent state was almost a thing unheard of in Greek history.

The bloom of Hellenism is found in such authors as Plato, Xenophon, Sophocles; we discover in these not graciousness, not tenderness merely, but spirituality.

"O may I live sinless and pure in every word and deed ordained by those firm laws that rule on high," exclaim the Chorus in the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. In Isocrates we meet an equivalent of the golden rule.

Clement of Alexandria but repeats this

author when he says that the true sacrifice is a pure heart. The ethical objections to heathenism are anticipated, in language as strong as Christians use, by Xenophanes. Plato and Pythagoras set before us as aim a likeness to God.

In fact, at the basis of Hellenism lay a conception wholly foreign to the Oriental or the Roman, *i.e.*, Humanitarianism, bright, free, joyous; a sense of human dignity underlies Hellenic thought.

It is a cheap criticism to condemn all this as mere anthropomorphism; it will in practice be found that to displace this is to bring in something far worse.

At the Persian invasion the Greeks would not mutilate any dead body, while the Carthaginians at the siege of Selinus first killed and then mutilated 16,000 prisoners "after their wont."

Socrates, dying by Greek law, dies without pain, surrounded by friends, attended to the grave by love and sympathy. Christ, dying by Roman law, dies with every aggravation of pain; as if crucifixion were not agony enough the Romans brutally mock the sufferer, then tear with scourges the patient limbs they were about to crucify.

We need not exaggerate here. I would not imply that all Romans and Carthaginians were cruel and all Greeks gentle. The noblest assertion of humanity in all

heathen antiquity is contained in the Latin line—

Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto.

It is a Latin poet who tells us that man is dearer to the gods than to himself. Not once or twice have Roman and Carthaginian been gentle and the Hellene cruel.

But the broad distinctions indicated are typical of the races, and by these only can we judge and from these generalise. Humanitarianism inspired the art of Greece; it was the breath and soul of a Phidias or an Apelles, as it was the inspiration of much that was best in the theology of Alexandria or Antioch.

This, we may perhaps add, has been one reason why to-day the Greek Church does not, like the Latin, cut off its clergy from the humanising influence of family life.

Thinking nobly of man and respecting even the slave, it was natural for the Hellenistic theologians to hold optimistic views of his destiny. Here I must pause to explain that *by Optimism is not meant a system of easy good-nature; it does not exclude the idea of the sternest retribution; it does exclude sin and pain as permanent elements in the universe. This persistence of evil is what I mean by Pessimism. Its final conquest and absorption by good is Optimism.*

Hardly less natural is it to find in Hellenistic theology an emphatic assertion

of freewill. Thus a seeming difficulty finds an explanation which is worth notice here.

Nowadays the common argument in favour of pessimism is the inalienable freedom of man. But far other was the Hellenistic view.

Their position was substantially this. It is the fact of freedom that makes man capable of rescue. As the will is free it is *never fixed in sin*. But when asked why, if free, the will finally gravitates towards God, they would reply, Because Goodness is *the most powerful magnet*, because the will is *reasonable*, and therefore bound eternally to the Divine REASON (Logos); because no creature is ever beyond its Creator's power to repair effectually.

Thus it is easy to see how and why an optimistic theology harmonises with acceptance of free will, and pessimism, with its denial, as the story of Latin theology shows plainly to have been, in fact, the case. Latin theology, in becoming definitely pessimist, became predestinarian.

With their humanitarianism we can hardly err in connecting the peculiar charm of early Greek legends; while almost all nations have their myths and sagas, the Greeks have, more than any other race, known how to impart to theirs at once a perennial, because a human interest and a unique suggestiveness. Certainly in

these points the contrast with the Romans is very marked.

As a rule, early Hellenic legend and poetry is bright and joyous. A certain gaiety of tone pervades Homer and Hesiod—a love of life and of adventure. Indeed, two of the earliest Greek books are books of travel, and furnish abundant evidence of that interest in everything human of which mention has been made. Yet this is not all; for, exactly because it is so human, Greek literature has its not infrequent periods of depression, almost of melancholy. But its sadness is pathos, not pessimism.

One of the best historians of Greece dwells on the interesting fact how, from the very first, the Hellenes laid stress on words. Where we are readers they were talkers. From the infancy of the nation the power of eloquence was acknowledged, and public speaking was felt to be “the standing engine of government and the proximate cause of obedience,” long before the heroic had given place to the historical period.

Even the most careless reader (says Maurice) must perceive the weight attached to “winged words” in the *Iliad*. How great is the sense of their mystery and power, how real the stress assigned to them as characterising human beings, as means of influencing and communicating with the gods.

Hermes, God of Eloquence, has a high rank in the Greek Pantheon; the power of wisdom and that of words become associated in the Hellenic mind. Socrates is as "deeply concerned as his opponents to discover the meaning of words" as a preliminary to any true knowledge.

Long after writing was known the Grecian laws were unwritten, and the Greek States remained without any written constitutions. The Greeks preferred the living voice—its rhythm and music. They were inventors of the Dialogue. On Olympus the gods hold council and plead as orators. On the shield of Achilles the pictures are not complete without a representation of the Assembly and the speakers on each side.

That a race with such instincts should have founded the Homily, and that all the great Councils should have been held in the East, seems natural.

Here, too, the contrast is marked with Latinism; we know from the historian Socrates that preaching was introduced at a comparatively late date in the Roman Church. While there were no sermons at Rome, Origen is said to have preached every day at Alexandria; his commentaries are in great part homilies. Neither in Tertullian nor in Cyprian's works is there a single homily. And when the Western theologians became preachers the contrast

is striking between the brief practical discourses of Leo and Maximus, and the elaborate orations of Gregory and Basil. St. Peter, "of the Golden Word," who is Latin, contrasts in his conciseness most vividly with the "golden-tongued" Chrysostom.

I have probably said enough to make clear the peculiar fitness of St. Paul's selection of Athens as a theatre for the proclamation of God's All-Fatherhood and of the Divine Immanence, and for an appeal in confirmation of these doctrines to "certain of your own poets." Here is really an affirmation of a quasi-inspiration in Heathenism, and a recognition of a certain continuity of religion from the earliest to the latest forms.

It must be remembered that all through I mean by Hellenistic theology that which was the inspiration for four centuries (or more) of the schools of Alexandria, of Cesarea, of Cappadocia, of Antioch, and of many teachers both in East and West who had learned from them. This Hellenism was the earliest formulated theology as it was that of the foremost thinkers in the Church's golden age.

Extending over so wide an area, and adopted by many minds in different centuries in varying environment, there were obviously many shades of difference, there were various standpoints. Yet it may,

speaking broadly, be here maintained that all Hellenistic theology rests largely on a few axioms* which may be gathered with sufficient accuracy from what has been stated.

To all Hellenists Man's worth and dignity and God's love and mercy are fundamental assumptions; so is the kindred of man and God. Most usually this was expressed in the Logos doctrine, i.e., the *Eternal* REASON binds to God all *reasonable* creatures; this tie or bond is *inalienable*, hence the very worst are redeemable, and as God wills their redemption, this design must finally take effect.

Assuming this kindred of man and God and man's need of help, what more natural than an Incarnation? It is almost inevitable that the immanent Logos should visibly show Himself. *Noblesse oblige*, He must manifest Himself, must render visible in human form the invisible presence which is everywhere. Where the Latins incline to wonder at the amazing condescension of the Incarnation, the Hellenist would rather wonder were there no Incarnation to aid mankind, suffering and sinning.

For how can this manifestation be conceived of if not as of itself redemptive? How can Light shine and not dispel darkness?

* See Preface.

That Christ should have become man in itself guarantees salvation. Athanasius tells us that His appearance in the flesh set everything right ; it is, to use his own phrase, just as if a great King were to take up his abode in one of the houses of a vast city—immediately all strife is hushed, all becomes peace and harmony. Or again, the Incarnate Christ is looked upon as introducing into our nature an antidote against sin and ruin—a heavenly leaven which purges all humanity ; a sort of celestial lymph, if the homely illustration may be used, which removes all corruption.

Thus it is not difficult to understand a striking point of difference between the two Churches—viz., that the East bent its energies to explaining the mystery of the birth of Christ, of the union of man and God ; while the West loves to devise, and is to this day devising, fresh theories of the death of Christ and of the meaning of the Atonement. To the Hellenist the Atonement is hardly more than a detail—an expansion of the Incarnation.

Incarnatus est was the Hellenistic motto, while the Latin device ran thus *Crucifixus est*. Hellenism sat by the cradle, while Latinism stood by the cross of the Lord. Christ Incarnate has been more to the Hellenist than the Crucified Christ, Christ risen than Christ dying.

A warning may be useful as we pass on. It is not wise to turn, as some are inclined, the doctrine of Immanence into a sort of fetish.

The significance of the Divine Immanence theologically does not lie in pressing it narrowly to the exclusion of Transcendence* (the best thinkers of Hellenism taught both), but rather in the implied assertion of our nearness to God as an eternal fact—of the Divine as everywhere present and working in Nature.

Nor must we credit these early thinkers with any rigid scientific accuracy, or even with absolute consistency. They wrote out of the fulness of the heart, sometimes burdened with the cares of struggling churches, often like those who builded the walls of Jerusalem, with the sword in one hand and the trowel in the other.

The microscopic critic can detect without difficulty weak joints in their armour. Sometimes they conceal by a pious fraud

* The line separating Hellenistic and Latin theology certainly does not coincide with the line dividing the conceptions of Immanence and Transcendence. Augustine almost at the end of his career asserted God's Immanence (*De civ. D. xi. 20*). So did Cyprian (*De id. van*). Athanasius, who is optimist, says that God is *naturally outside of all things*, but is in them by goodness and power. The Hellenistic Platonists, who are advocates of Transcendence, are optimists in theology. By many Hellenistic theologians God was regarded as in Himself Transcendent, but Immanent through the Logos.

the optimism which really inspired their thinking—a fact which has misled some students who read into the second Christian century the moral standard of the nineteenth, where veracity is concerned. But, on the whole, their drift and standpoint are clear.

The truth is that the Hellenist had his thoughts full of a real, actual deliverance of all humanity—an idea foreign to Latin theology. In a word, the standpoint of Hellenistic theology is Salvation. Here we may say that the two theologies differ essentially: the Latin talks more of Redemption and believes less in it, while of Hellenism the opposite is true.—Tennyson really is Hellenising when he teaches, “One law, one life, one element, and one far-off Divine event, to which the whole Creation slowly moves.”

To the Latin, Christ, once a Saviour, is hereafter to change His rôle, and by some wholly unexplained process is to be altered into a rigorous Judge (a veritable moral transubstantiation).

Very characteristic of Hellenism are its conceptions of Resurrection, Judgment, Death. In its view these are hardly more than modes of Redemption—channels through which it works. All are from the same God—are expressions of the same purpose working to the same end.

In the *Anastasis* the best Hellenistic

thought saw essentially the crown and climax of the saving work of the Logos, not as in the narrower view so common in the West, chiefly or mainly a piecing together of the fragments of the decayed body.

It is strange how little the great Pauline idea of Resurrection as *in essence redemptive*, as Life, in all its fulness, flowing from the risen Christ to every child of Adam, has been apprehended by Western theology. But this is precisely the point which the Hellenists grasped. Specially is this so in the school of Antioch and in the doctrine of the most distinguished of the Cappadocians. To them Resurrection is a synonym for Salvation; it is Redemption; it is the Regeneration or New Birth of humanity.

Closely connected with this is the Hellenistic view of Death. While to the Latins it is penal, to them it is remedial. It is a medicine sent not for the punishment of sin, but for its removal. Death is really the Great Workman taking to pieces that which he has made in order to repair its imperfections. It is the artist melting down the statue in order to remould it, freed from dross and alien matter. It is the Great Potter refashioning his handiwork.

Hence to kill, to pulverise, to destroy, is at bottom but to change for the better, to

remodel and renew. Strange as this may seem to us, who are trained on Latin models, I could undertake to fill pages with quotations from the most eminent Hellenists to show its truth. To such writers there is no penalty *purely* or chiefly *vindictive*, all punishments are essentially medicinal. To such a system there is no anger, truly so called, in God. His wrath is either a mode of that Love which God is—not which He has (a vital distinction)—or is at least administered and guided by it.

It is hardly possible not to connect such a view of death with early racial beliefs. The Greeks could not read the opening lines of the *Iliad* without perceiving the identity of the God of Healing and the God of Death.

And as to early Greek conceptions of the grave, which in spirit have passed into Hellenistic theology, let us hear one who is a most competent witness and whose bias is distinctly Latin rather than Greek: "In their pensive and exquisite pathos, in their reserve, in their dignity and human affection, in their manly simplicity, these Athenian monuments may be taken as the highest type of funeral emblems that the world possesses. They present an aspect of death, pensive, affectionate, social, peaceful, and beautiful."*

* The Meaning of Hist., p. 315.—Harrison.

On the kindred topic, "Judgment," I cannot pause or linger here. And yet a wide field opens up, and light falls in unexpected quarters when the Hellenistic thought is fully grasped which sees in "Judgment" a process not vindictive, but *redemptive*.

Perhaps few portions of the Bible are less understood* than the passages (*e.g.*, in the Old Testament Prophets) dealing with this question.

I would that it were possible to quote here some of the language of men like Jerome, which unites to the deepest conviction of the terror and awfulness of "Judgment," a conviction no less profound that its purpose and end is restoration.†

One who stands in the foremost rank among the Greek Fathers does not scruple to say—in the most formal statement of doctrine which he has penned—that God announces His future Judgment *for the cure of the diseases of the soul*; it is a threat to the frivolous and vain, but by those *who are more intelligent* it is believed to be a medicine, *God's way of curing His creature* (*Greg. Nyssen Cat. or. viii.*). Com-

* Take, for instance, *Isaiah xlv. 23*, quoted by St. Paul and applied to the Day of Judgment, *Romans xiv. 10*, *Phil. ii. 10-1*.

† See "Universalism Asserted as the Hope of the Gospel." Seventh Edition, pp. 190-200.

ment on such words is needless, and on the infinite vista they open.

It may here be admitted that the Hellenists were on the whole nearer to Pelagius than to Augustine in their view of Adam's sin and its consequences ; it is certain that the place which the fall occupied in Augustine's theology was in Hellenism replaced by the conception of the indelible Image of God implanted in every man at creation, and by a conviction that man can always help himself.

This position was almost inevitable if racial tendencies be remembered.

Divines so famous as St. Chrysostom were practically Pelagian, and the divergence of Latinism and Hellenism is well illustrated by the indifference of the East to this controversy ; while Augustine thundered hardly a ripple stirred in the Eastern Church.

Hellenism has had a more scientific instinct than her Latin rival ; in its view not alone has there been a continuous working of the Spirit of Inspiration in the past in all ages and all peoples, but in the future world no break can be thought of in the continuity of that redemptive process which must go on till the education of the entire family of man is completed.

Carrying out the principles of continuity, there is in the Hellenistic view no real ground for the distinction often made

between sacred and secular, as though the universe were constructed in water-tight compartments; there is not "scientific" and "religious," for all that is true is religious.

The Hellenist will not style anything common or unclean, still less call humanity a mass of dirt, of mire and sin, with Augustine, or style the vast majority reprobate with Calvin, or the very elect *dung*! with Hooker. Nor will he know anything of the gulf which since Augustine's day has separated for all Western theology the "kingdoms" of Grace and Nature.

In harmony with the foregoing is the less weight attached by the Hellenists to any external organisation. This I have already noticed (p. 31.) Yet it would be an anachronism to follow writers like Allen ("Continuity of Christian Thought"), and read into primitive Hellenism our modern laxity with regard to sects and rites. Hellenism is not an anticipation of Protestantism; it lays weight on ecclesiastical order; it reveres or at least respects Tradition and Precedent even when it will not blindly follow their lead.

To the Church it looks up as to our spiritual mother (yet without formulating any rigid theory of its claims or organisation), whose Sacraments enlighten and purify.

But the basis on which Hellenism stood

was wider and more comprehensive than that of its Latin sister—it was broad gauge, while Latinism was narrow gauge. To Alexandria all bards and sages, all philosophers, are as *truly*, though *not* as *fully* or adequately inspired, as those of Judæa, for the spiritual is everywhere. The very Sacraments are an extension of that common order which is yet Divine and eternal. As the Incarnation is “natural” in a true sense, so are they.

The Nature worship of the Hellenes, which placed a divinity everywhere—in stream and wood, on mountain top, in lonely glen, by the ocean shore—would find congenial embodiment in such a view of Christian rites; while to the Latin, whose religion was hard and meagre, Sacraments tend rather to become arbitrary signs and channels of grace, bridges thrown across the gulf that separates man and God.

SEMITISM (LATINISM).



SEMITISM (LATINISM).

As we, so to say, excavate the deposits that ages of religious civilisation have left behind, we discover two distinct if unequal strata uniting to form what we know as Latin Christianity. There is co-existing with the Latin element another, derived from Semitic sources, which to this day persists as a living force.

Bearing in mind that Latin theology had its cradle, not on European, but on African soil, where Latin colonists had long breathed an atmosphere saturated with Punic conceptions, the composite character of this theology becomes easy to understand.

New Carthage was, in fact, built at the confluence of two civilisations—the Latin and the Semitic.

So great has been the part played by the Semites in the history of religious thought, not alone in the fact that the Old Testament was the work of Semitic hands, but also in the profound if indirect influence of Semitism on Western Christianity, that

a few pages must here be devoted to a rapid sketch of the Semites—of their origin, their creeds and religious ideals.

At the dawn of European history, the Mediterranean shores were the home of three great religious civilisations—Hellenic, Egyptian, Semitic; a little later came Latin, equally important. With Egyptian we need not concern ourselves; it has died intestate, and leaving no heirs of its thought.

But Hellenism, Latinism, Semitism still live. They are in our midst, and often even when we know it not still form our ideals and help to mould our thoughts. Indeed, the story of theology is largely the story of their wars, jealousies, alliances, developments.

In the fact that the title over the cross was written in Hebrew, in Greek, and in Latin we have a foreshadowing of the course of Christian thought. Very many centuries before the Christian era—a precise date can hardly be fixed—Semitic tribes colonised that vast district which we more or less vaguely know as Mesopotamia, lying between the Persian Gulf, the Zagros Mountains, and Arabia.

Here it was that, favoured by the soil, great empires were founded, and military and sacerdotal civilisations were developed.

Outside the Assyrian and Babylonian territories strictly so called, we find also in

Arabia and in the narrow isthmus between the Mediterranean and the desert (which forms a passage-way between the great empire of the Nile and its rivals of the Euphrates) a group of smaller Semitic tribes—*e.g.*, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Israel, &c.

Doubtless shades of difference can be detected in many ways between the various members of the vast Semitic aggregate. Some were rude pastoral tribes. One branch was almost exclusively maritime; others formed highly organised communities.

Some members of the system were of a softer and more voluptuous, others of a hard and cruel, type; some united cruelty and sensuality; but, as a rule, everywhere the same general tendencies existed. In Semitism natural forces personified, chiefly the destructive and reproductive, became deities. Sexual attributes receive special prominence, and female deities are numerous and influential. Evidence seems to exist which indicates that originally a tie of kindred between the god and his worshipper was recognised, but in practice it was hardly so. The deities were viewed as far off, and the worshippers were hardly more than slaves. Not seldom the Semitic deity was cruel and without pity. The specially odious feature of certain Semitic creeds is the combination of excessive lust with excessive cruelty.

In Babylon, swarms of prostitutes surrounded certain temples, and to be a virgin constituted a positive disqualification for marriage.

Assyrian cruelty was hideous, accompanied by a sensuality as revolting.

Such religions are often marked by a wild orgiastic strain, half lustful, half sanguinary; the impassive Oriental when roused becomes the most frantic of revellers, the most licentious of worshippers, the most pitiless of devotees.

In Arabia, little girls were often burnt alive by their fathers.* The presence of the parents at the sacrifice, and the mother's willing surrender of her infants, were points on which stress was laid.

Doubtless in Semitism there were nobler and softer elements, and with these loftier ideals and an earnestness of tone which explain its fitness for high destinies as the parent of Judaism and indirectly of Christianity.

Not all Semite deities were cruel. There were bright and joyous festivals with dance and song in honour of the Queen of Heaven. Especially would this be the case in pastoral tribes where primitive use lingered, as in early Hebrew story we note a more joyful strain than in its later literature.

Geographically, for physical antecedents

* R. Smith, "Religion of Semites," p. 370.

should not be forgotten, Semitic creeds as a rule originate in hot and arid regions where the burning desert or monotonous plain alternates with the green oasis. In such scenes man is dwarfed while Nature is all-powerful and works by contrasts that suggest dualism, or by exhibitions of force that breed terror and prompt to resignation. In such surroundings the deity's chief attribute is power ; while remoteness from man, not beneficence or nearness to humanity, is suggested. Naturally, plasticity is wanting in creeds of this type. Such environments tend to depress, and, by reminding man of his insignificance, to encourage the growth of despotism. That free development of the faculties which is essential to the ripening of liberty is discouraged.

The tendency is to a narrow circle of ideas, to hard views of life and destiny, and to a toughness of fibre well exemplified in the Jewish race. In such cases the religious life, because its range is narrower, often burns with more intensity ; religious earnestness may be conceded to the Semite—in no race more fitly may be found the material out of which the prophet is fashioned. And if the bright and joyous fancies of the Hellenic legend, the fair humanities of old, are wanting, still many suggestive myths occur in Semitism, the chief legends of Creation and Paradise are Semitic.

Perhaps the three Semitic civilisations containing the most repulsive elements were the Assyrian, the Babylonian, and the Canaanite; of the latter stock was the Phœnician, the founders of Carthage. Of the creed which they professed we know that it retained many of the most cruel features of Semitism. Even the stern Romans stood aghast at the hideous Moloch worship of Carthage.

We read of Roman soldiers surprising such worshippers at their sacrifices, and being struck with so great a horror that they rescued the victims, and hanged the priests. Yet these sacrifices, though forbidden, lingered long at New Carthage, when under Roman rule, at least as late as the first Christian century.

I need not attempt to tell here even in outline the familiar story of Phœnician colonisation.

This race occupied, indeed, a position quite unique in early history, in their exclusive devotion to commerce and colonisation, avoiding war whenever possible.

Yet the Phœnicians gave birth to the greatest captain of antiquity, and Tyre cost Alexander the Great more trouble to capture than any other city in Asia. Carthage, their most splendid colony, counted at the date of its fall 700,000 souls, and reigned for centuries queen of the Mediterranean, while Rome was hardly more than

a hamlet ; and although we are compelled to learn its story through the medium of reports furnished by its bitter enemies, yet even these cannot dim the lustre of its fame.

I have no intention of riding a theory to death ; there is room for a reasonable difference of opinion as to the precise extent of Semitic influence which its Carthaginian associations exercised over Latin Christianity.

Yet that this influence has been deep and *permanent* abundant facts testify, unless I read them quite wrongly.

Carthaginian soil had been for many centuries the home of an intense Semitism before the Latin immigration.

And how readily colonists absorb the influences which surround them is a fact of which history furnishes abundant instances.

And mutual influence would have been still more probable if the affinities be borne in mind which seem to exist between the Latin and Oriental mind.

Certainly the points of contact between Latin theology and Semitism are striking, whatever the explanation be.

As we read the odious lines in which Tertullian,* and his disciple Cyprian in milder words, gloat over the anticipated enjoyment of one day gazing at the tor-

* De Spect, xxx.

ments of the damned, it is difficult not to feel that here we have a survival of the exultation over the agonies of captive enemies which Assyrian monuments disclose.

We may go a step further here. The tortures depicted on Assyrian monuments are, in fact, punishments for heresy, for disobedience to the God who is King.

It is, then, significant to remember that precisely on that soil where Semitism had for centuries been the dominant spiritual force the cry for vengeance on heresy received the formal and reasoned assent of the greatest of the Latin Doctors.

It is worth consideration also that alike in Latin and in Semitic theology is the tendency apparent to venerate power rather than goodness or reasonableness in the Deity.

The first great Carthaginian theologian made fear the basis of repentance. It is obvious that a Deity who is feared must be appeased. It is at least a remarkable coincidence with the Semitic view of God and the need there is to propitiate Him,* that in so typical a Latin as Cyprian we find over and over again stress laid on the need of "placating," "satisfying" God.

* To appease the pitiless Deity everything must be surrendered—the maiden's chastity; the only child as the most valuable; the infant, as the most pure; the guest; the bosom friend.

The contrast with early Hellenism is very suggestive here. The lesson has not yet been fully and fairly drawn which the contemplation of two simultaneous renderings of the Gospel (at Carthage and at Alexandria), so opposed on vital points, must suggest to the impartial mind.

Other points of contact that may be named between Latinism and Semitism are these: a tendency to a low estimate of man—whose distance from God is emphasized—a leaning to pessimistic views of his destiny, a hard and callous tone, a bias to sacerdotalism, a readiness to accept some form of fatalism (diluted to what is known as predestinarianism in Western theology). Plausible explanations may, perhaps, be offered to account for some of these. I am content to point out the resemblance which is, on the whole, clear; while the general contrast with Hellenism is no less evident.

I must ask those who are impartial students of Augustine to remember the marked union in his elaborated system of theology of a cruel harshness and a pronounced *sexuality* of tone—significant in one who was the great Western Doctor, shaping and moulding for centuries the religious thought of the entire Latin Church.

Those who will bear in mind the rapid outline just given of Semitism can hardly

fail to be struck with the parallel here between the theologian and the Semite of old. Some other explanation may be forthcoming than that which the facts broadly taken seem to suggest.

I do not pretend to decide—*judicent peritiores*. But it may be noticed that in Augustine's theories "sexuality" is painfully prominent,* nay (it would seem), is forced into a prominence so great that many passages do not bear to be rendered into English.

* Even Harnack styles them "loathsome."

LATINISM.

LATINISM.

IN the story of Latinism, as of Hellenism, conquest and colonisation play an all-important part.

When the long duel between Rome and Carthage ended in the downfall of the latter, a new Carthage was founded and colonised by Latin settlers. Here Roman and Carthaginian met and blended; Latin law, manners, and speech were grafted on a Punic stock, and produced a well-marked type.

Here, *and not in Rome*, or on the Italian peninsula, where the first Church was really Hellenistic, was the birthplace of Latin Christianity.

Here was founded a school of theology of which Tertullian is the earliest Doctor known to us, impassioned, narrow, fiery, cruel, but always vigorous and practical.

Of the North African Church, this only need be said here, that its rise was rapid, its adherents widespread, its bishops counted by hundreds, and that vigour and earnestness, tinged with a certain blend of

early Puritanism, marked its spirit from the first.

Details and dates are, in so brief a sketch as the present, impossible, it must suffice to add two facts of some significance.

In no other Church were the internal strifes so bitter as here. War to the death, war waged without pity, remorse, or scruple, tore to pieces this flourishing church, when the Docetist rose against the Catholic. No other Church of antiquity was overtaken by ruin so complete as this. Extinction, and not desolation merely, was the fate in store for the Church of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine.

There are few things more striking than the great part played by the dark Continent in the field of early theology. On African soil were born the three Fathers who tower above their fellows, whose significance is for all time, viz., Origen, Athanasius, Augustine.

Africa thus claims as her sons the greatest names at once in the Eastern and in the Western Church.

It was an African by birth who decided one of the most momentous issues presented to the primitive Church, who more than any man settled for all time the great question whether Christianity should rest on a Trinitarian basis, or with Arius

lapse into a virtual Polytheism,* and so finally come to sink with Socinus into a humanistic faith.

On African soil, at Alexandria and at Carthage, were developed the two great schools of theology which really mark the theological watershed.

It was an African, one true to the type, who devised that rendering of Christian thought which, in its three characteristics—legal, sacerdotal, predestinarian—overspread the entire West. It was an African by birth who at Alexandria worked out that earlier and better version of the Gospel which for four or five centuries was dominant in the Eastern Church, which to-day is waking from its slumbers, and bids fair to regain its primitive empire and ascendancy, and, in spirit at least, to rule over modern thought, as at once Liberal, Catholic, and Evangelical, in the best sense.

On the whole, the most remarkable figure in all ecclesiastical history is the African who, as the fifth century opened, unconsciously but truly fulfilled the dream of Hannibal conquering, not by

* To Arius Christ was indeed God, but only a secondary God; and it is the special weakness of Arianism that the more stress it lays on Christ's divinity the more clearly does it become Polytheistic. It is quasi-Polytheism in the garb of Monotheism, while Trinitarianism is Monotheism in the semblance of Polytheism.

arms but by intellect, the whole Roman world.

Nor was the signal good fortune of Rome exhausted by the rise of Augustine in the very crisis of her fate, as explained above, with a theology "to the manner born," adapted in its essence to her needs.

Not long after Augustine's death the whole North African Church perished as a living force, and with it perished the sole power capable of seriously withstanding the extreme Papal claims. For the Roman polity is built of two factors—one native, one colonial. Its dogmatic system is in *its root* Carthaginian; its Papacy is home-grown.

Had the North African Church continued to grow and to produce vigorous intellects of the type of Tertullian and Cyprian, the daughter Church might have proved a formidable rival to the mother. For little tenderness was shown by the most distinguished African Churchmen to the rising supremacy of Rome, and in the teaching of the three Carthaginian Doctors there were elements inconsistent with Papal claims.

Thus Cyprian's episcopal theory, if strictly carried out, is inconsistent with Papalism—*Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*.*

* De Unit. Note the legal phrasing! It is a conveyancer, not a theologian, who is writing.

And in Tertullian and Augustine were Puritan elements tending to Geneva, which Rome as far as possible rejected.

But the extinction of the North African Church by Islam left to Rome a free hand to develop her claims to ecclesiastical supremacy.

Rome had long been a borrower in the intellectual markets, and that on the largest scale.

From the Greeks Pagan Rome had already taken her art, science, poetry, painting, philosophy. From the Greeks the Roman Church took the Nicene faith, and accepted the great Œcumenical Councils, which were all Eastern.

From Carthage Rome had copied the model of her first fleet, as now from Carthage she borrowed the Augustinian theology, and not a little else.

Tertullian's famous argument against heretics on the ground of prescription she took as a convenient weapon, one quite in harmony with her spirit.

Cyprian's Sacerdotalism (in full) and his episcopal theory (*in part*) Rome took ; while from Augustine her borrowings were wholesale. But here, too, caution was needed, for Augustinianism is a drug so strong that it needs dilution before it can be generally used with safety.

There were many hard sayings to be pared away, much that needed

judicious editing, and something to be concealed; but to Augustinianism in its spirit Rome has remained true,*
“*Grattez le Latin et vous trouverez le Carthaginien.*”

It is well to begin our discussion by a frank avowal of all that is excellent in Latinism.

Many and far-reaching are the merits of the type.

The stately framework of Law which Latin genius flung around the whole West demands our praise; in the best Latin minds there is a steadfastness and reverence, a deeper sense of order and of the sanctities of home, a more firmly-rooted feeling of sin, than Hellenism exhibits. And it is no less true that the same steady, practical tone distinguishes, on the whole, Latin Christianity. If it has less originality than its sister, it has had more sobriety; if it is less speculative, it has more self-restraint.

Whatever its faults the Papacy was a master builder, and its efforts were rewarded by a stability its rival never possessed.

Inestimable have been the services of Latin Christianity in holding together a distracted Europe—in bringing to barbarous tribes a purer faith and a message

* Up to the eighteenth century, when the Bull Unigenitus was put forth.

which was a call to a higher life, not merely hereafter but here.

By a happy contradiction the Roman Church, while in theory autocratic, furnished the most democratic element in mediæval life.

It was at once strong and pliant.

Indeed, to Roman institutions may be traced ultimately the municipal organisations of modern Europe which became the nurseries of liberty. Even in Rome's narrow conceptions of the unity of the Church there lay embedded a great principle—a protest against undue isolation; rigid, as they were, they were an assertion of the value of corporate life; they formed a certain approximation to teaching the solidarity of the human family. The Roman formula, if not the highest, was perhaps the most workable at the time. Rome had those statesmanlike instincts which are among the rarest endowments of any race. Foremost, perhaps, among these was her steady adherence to one great idea. When all around her was rocking, when Europe reeled under the blows of barbarian hordes—whether the Hun, or the Teuton, or the Moslem threatened—her answer was always the same.

The secret of the success of the Latin Church has been “This one thing I do”;—one centre; one purpose; one head;

one great doctor; one scheme of thought, one uniform discipline; nay, only one language and one ritual everywhere in Divine service.

History presents us with no instance of racial vitality so striking as that by which out of the rotting elements of Imperialism was developed a new and better empire; from the soil which a thousand excesses had not exhausted there grew up an aftermath more dignified, more vast, more stately than ever—the Latin Papacy.

Not a few of the Carthaginian teachers stand in the front rank intellectually, nor do they impress us more by their genius than by their abundant zeal, their fervid loyalty to the Church and their practical tone.

Martyrs so noble as Perpetua, Felicitas, Satyrus, shed lustre on the North African Church. Nor can their heroism be forgotten so long as men revere true devotion, and respect—even if they will not imitate—the faith that dares all things rather than abandon its convictions.

The story of Latin Christianity would be left half-told were it not, like Hellenism, traced to its roots in national tendencies, in race instincts, even in physical surroundings. Something has been already said on this head (pp. 26-28), and the influence of geography in the varying developments of Latinism and Hellenism has been partly indicated.

Hellenism was, in a word, quasi-insular; Latinism was continental. Latinism had a firmer nucleus than either Hellenism or Semitism, rooted in its central seat in that peninsula which Nature has marked out for a great rôle, which by its very position seems to claim the dominion of the Mediterranean, which is almost a reduced picture of the world, including nearly every variety of climate, of soil, of physical configuration.

Possessing few harbours and a more fertile territory, the Roman tilled his fields, a husbandman and conservative; while the Hellenists were sailors, traders, and liberals. Yet one thing the Roman Campagna has always lacked which Hellas possessed—a sound air; it is almost as if the malaria of his home had helped to make the Roman gloomy and stern.

Three main elements go to form the Roman stock.

Chief is the Latin; then the Sabine*—a primitive mountain folk. From these two comes probably the hard, frugal type which we call Roman. From the third, the Etruscans, come elements which we can hardly err in calling Oriental, and which possess a special interest in the development of Latinism. Religiously viewed, Etruria was sacerdotal, while politically it was despotic—the mass of

* Perhaps more accurately the Oscan tribes.

the people seem to have been little more than serfs. We know enough of their beliefs to pronounce them dark and gloomy, and to be aware that the most prominent of their deities were malignant.*

Etruscan imagination revelled in cruel paintings of the future life—*e.g.*, in depicting demons carrying off souls for punishment—*i.e.*, scenes substantially the same as those in which Tertullian and Dante delighted, or which later occupied the brush of hundreds of Italian artists. To Etruria Rome owes the lictors, their axes and scourges, and a yet more repulsive feature—the gladiatorial games.

I suppose that no race so great as the Romans ever possessed so little speculative originality. The very name Rome aptly expresses the impression they made—it designates force, strength. The Roman type was prosaic—no art, no science, no philosophy existed; even Etrurian art seems borrowed from the Greeks. With so very meagre an intellectual outfit did this people start on that career which ended in a world-wide empire.

Perhaps no religion so cold, so simple in its beliefs, and yet so elaborate in its rites, can be found as the old Roman. It was a sort of early Positivism—a Ritual

* Traces remain of an old Italian malignant god, Veiovis.

first and afterwards a Creed. Of all faiths it was the most formal and the least mystical; it was almost a State cult and its deities State officials, its priesthood a sort of magistrature.

Most noteworthy is the very term "Religion," which in Latin implies a bond—if we adopt the most likely derivation—something that grips the man, that holds him as in a vice.

The reappearance in Latin Christianity of so many beliefs that distinguished the Latin from the Hellenist is striking. The old Roman was afraid of his deities as of unknown powers, and veiled his head in sacrificing.

Hence a great prominence in his creed of the idea of propitiation.

We have seen how bright and free was the relation of the Greek to his gods, "the fair humanities of old," it was far otherwise with the Roman. A peculiar narrowness and earnestness of conception marked the ties between him and his deity. Substantially, the same feeling has always characterised the Latin rendering of the Gospel. The Latin Churchman is the old Roman developed—beneath the surplice peeps out the toga. No graceful legends were sung of the Latin gods, no bright and sunny myths described their adventures. They were distant and feared; they did not mix with human beings and

beget children ; the Latin religious atmosphere was sombre and cloudy.

The Latins not unnaturally ascribe to God the quality in which they themselves most excel. They are by instinct rulers ; their God first of all is a Sovereign.

Latin Christianity is primarily a contrivance for government. It views religion as a great machinery adjusted as its chief function to reward and punish men. Whether the result be to damn or to save the greater number seems to its teachers almost indifferent. The good are rewarded ; the bad are damned ! Who can ask more ?

That God is a teacher, training as one family the entire race of men ; that He has a redemptive plan, wide as the world and which cannot fail ; that this is the meaning of the Gospel message, is a thought wholly foreign to the Latin mind.

As a further result of their strong passion for rule and zeal for order, the Latins easily accepted a system of Predes-
tination, which is in fact an extreme statement of God's authority, ordering and ruling every creature, fixing the destiny of each, without appeal and without apparent motive, long before birth, a view which no Hellenist ever did receive or could have received.

Where the Hellenist saw in the reason of man a reflection of the Divine, and felt that, if so, exactly in

proportion as theology ceased to be reasonable it ceased to be Divine, the first of the Carthaginians declared openly, "I believe because it is impossible." It is misleading to brush such phrases aside, as merely paradoxical; in fact, they are a startling revelation of Latin ideals and of tendencies that are persistent.

In Latinism we notice a certain aggressiveness of tone, a defiant spirit peculiarly its own; it has been unmistakably a church *militant*.

We need only compare the Apology of Tertullian with that of Justin Martyr or with Athanasius, or Clement of Alexandria, to note the difference.

Western theology is said to be distinctively Pauline. Certainly the temper in which St. Paul confronted Athenian Paganism reminds us far more of Alexandria than of Carthage.

Latin Christianity has had uniformly an air of command,* almost of arbitrariness, thus continuing an old tradition, for of old, the Romans ordered the state like an army; at the centre of their Pantheon was the grim War-god or Death-god Mars=*mors*-slayer. He was the oldest and most national form of Deity in the Italian worship generally.

* It is hardly a mere refinement to detect this in the leaning of the Roman Church in its early days to what is known as "Monarchianism" in theology.

To him referred the few national legends that were afloat. The founders of Rome are his sons, and are suckled by a wolf, the animal sacred to him. In Greece, on the contrary, the cult of Ares, the corresponding god, was little spread and was unknown in some localities. In Homer Ares is the most hateful of gods.

Beyond all men who have ever flourished the Romans were organisers from the very first.

Even with Romulus, institutions go hand in hand with arms. Numa, Servius, Tullius, Ancus, are chiefly famed as law givers. And the legal character of Latin Christianity, of which I shall have more to say, proves how persistent is this feature. With organisation comes discipline, and a stress laid on obedience ; a leaning to both has been marked alike in Pagan and in Papal Rome ; as a rule, even laxity of morals has been more easily pardoned in the Latin clergy than laxity of obedience.

A book so well known as Xenophon's *Retreat of the Ten Thousand* shows us the deep contrast of the Hellene and the Roman. The Greek soldiers wrangle and quarrel, and with complete liberty of speech dispute each new order of their generals.

We may see in such well-marked traits one at least of the reasons why the empire

of the world fell not to the Greeks but to the Romans.

This being so, we are not surprised to find in Latinism a greater respect for authority, as such, than in Hellenism.

We discover the very earliest of Latin theologians putting this tendency into words impossible to have been uttered by any Hellenist.

"I deem it audacity," says Tertullian, "to question a Divine command, for our obedience depends not on the goodness of the thing commanded, but on the command itself."*

These words, old as they are, have yet a modern ring; they remind us of many a phrase of Carlyle. They found an exact echo in a famous sentence of Augustine's Confessions: "*Da quod jubes et jube quod vis.*" They reveal to us a mode of thought always influential in Western theology.

Putting together what has been said, it is not difficult to see why the Latin would cling more to the idea of the Church as the visible embodiment of authority, and dwell more on the Episcopate than the Hellenists, who seem to have known little or nothing of the theory of apostolical succession.

Another reason, too, was perhaps this: that the Church as a Divinely endowed organism was a city of refuge, seeming to

* De pen. 4.

give a certain pledge of salvation, doubly welcome under the cloudy skies of Latinism and its meagre hopes.

Nor is this intended to imply that the Hellenist was indifferent to the Church's claim.

What I mean is that the Church was to the Latin more than to the Hellenist; it not only was more definite, more concrete, but it had a monopoly of salvation, in a sense which the early Hellenists never, in fact, recognised. To this day the East differs on this point from the West.

And yet, side by side with this narrow conception of the Church, there was slowly fermenting in the Latin mind from the first a rival conception, of which Augustine was the most influential expounder, of which the inner meaning was the assertion of the individual against the community.

Doubtless other forces helped to prepare the triumph of this idea in the sixteenth century. Mysticism largely helped, so did monasticism in its contemplative forms; so did the slowly ripening sense of human dignity, the passion for freedom, the increasing tendency to rely on reason.

But more than any individual was Augustine the unconscious prophet of this new evangel; Augustine, at once the Church's greatest son, and yet the greatest revolutionary, who, obedient to the Church and observant of its sacraments, by his

doctrine of grace and arbitrary predestination, helped to overthrow both.

And here let us note a seeming paradox—the Roman was at once the hardest and yet the most receptive of organisations. Foreign art, foreign cults, philosophy, literature were welcomed—after but slight resistance—at Rome. Rome, like the Israelites, “spoiled the Egyptians.” Rome “borrowed” on every hand.

When Jerome talks of “Latin thefts,” he is but saying that in theology the same “borrowing” prevailed.

To Latin realism, the exceptions are scarcely less striking than to Latin conservatism. The gods were for a long time hardly individuals, hardly more than abstractions. A formula is preserved that was used in dedicating a Roman temple. “Whoever thou art,” it said to the Deity, “whatever be thy name,” “whether thou art male or female.” Abstract gods excite little affection, and this may be the cause why the instability of the early Roman faith contrasts so strongly with the stability of Roman law and organisation. To this stability two factors contributed. The Romans united two seemingly inconsistent qualities. They possessed a “staying power,” a cohesion, which the Hellenists never had, and to this they united a “push” and energy no less marked.

Pursuing our comparison of the Latin

and the Hellene, I may add another difference: while to the Greek his tiny state or, it might be, his single city, formed almost to the last the political unit, the Latin citizen grew up (after the early struggles were over) under the shadow of a vast State or Empire. The imperial sentiment was thenceforth always present to the Roman mind.

Closely connected with this was the centralising tendency; as the circumference of Roman territory widened, so was the central authority reinforced till the Republic grew into an empire. By a similar process the Christian Commonwealth at Rome developed into the Papacy.

And as outside the Roman citizenship, taken broadly, all were outcasts, so outside the Church all were lost; but in both cases a redeeming feature existed. To Church and Empire alike easy terms of admission were offered. Just as the Imperial purple was worn by Goths, Syrians, or Peasants, so might the Papacy be won by a swineherd. Citizenship was liberally granted in both ecclesiastical and imperial Rome, and the highest dignities were freely open to merit in any quarter.

But let us note, the aristocratic bias of the Latin was not lost, though it might be latent, from motives of policy.

While Greek Particularism was at bottom democratic and, when Christian-

ised, gave birth to Universalism, so Latin Cosmopolitanism was at bottom aristocratic. It found expression in Papal autocracy, and welcomed from Augustine an election which confined salvation to those arbitrarily chosen and incomparably fewer than the saved.

Republican he might be in name, but the Roman was by instinct an aristocrat. The Roman patrician had at first a monopoly of the religious observances. What are the elect of Augustine's scheme but a patrician caste with a monopoly of heaven's favour? a spiritual aristocracy face to face with a vast proletariat?

The imperial instinct is closely allied to the legal. *Cedant arma togæ* is a line characteristic of the Roman, which we may freely render—After the Conqueror comes the Lawyer.

When Virgil describes a typical Roman—Cato—in the Shades it is as laying down law to his hearers; when the same poet speaks of Cæsar it is as thundering along the Euphrates, and then *making laws* for the vanquished. The instinct of the jurist lay embedded in the Roman; his faith was a shell, a compact. Roman paganism was a sort of legal process.

Inevitably, this temper passed into the ecclesiastical domain. The Church became a Christian Forum; the Temple of Christ

grew into a tribunal*—where, in a familiar phrase, man stands at the bar of Heaven—where God is plaintiff and man defendant.

As early as Tertullian prescription and precedent are made the tests of truth. "Don't," he says, "appeal to the Bible, where your chance of victory is perhaps nothing, and at best doubtful."† Salvation in such a Church naturally becomes a scheme—set out in a Covenant as by some Celestial Chancery, or as a compact where the persons of the Blessed Trinity sit in council like plenipotentiaries.

A mind of this type busies itself with defining. You may trace this tendency everywhere in the Western Church. The Roman Catholics have loved to mark out the stages by which the erring soul must travel in its way back to God. The penitent must pass by the stages of (i) Contrition (ii) Confession (iii) Satisfaction. By a final refinement, truly Latin in idea, Contrition is subdivided into two varieties, Contrition proper and quasi-contrition or Attrition.

* A fact which made this tendency the more significant in Western Christianity was this, that the Teutonic tribes, out of whose ranks Europe has been largely formed, shared this forensic temperament. Thus, when in process of time the intellectual and religious leadership passed into Germanic hands, the spirit, if not the old legal conception of Latin Christianity, was retained.

† De Presc. 19.

A similar tendency leads Western theology to split up worship into three separate forms—*Latria*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Dulia*—to assign to each a separate province.

In a like spirit, Latin devotion has not been content to travel in thought along the *via dolorosa* from the judgment-seat of Pilate to Calvary; it must realistically mark, as on a chart, fourteen Stations of the Cross.

Thus, too, the Latin Church defines its "seven" sacraments and "seven" deadly sins. Indeed, by its elaborate classification of sins into venial and mortal it loses moral certainty, and often, in fact, Paradise is suspended on a hair—on the casuist's skill in distinguishing rightly the class to which each offence is to be referred.

Nor is this confined to the Roman Catholic communion. We can, *e.g.*, trace a similar bent in unexpected quarters—*e.g.*, in Bunyan's allegory. The great Nonconformist lays down as on a map the stages of his Pilgrim's route—marks each turning, describes the stiles and footpaths, does not fail to record the very signposts.

So rooted were these tendencies in the Western Church that Grotius, while heading a revolt against the Anselmian theories, remains true to the forensic idea of the Atonement; while the Reformers, rebelling against Rome, still urged a forensic justification. Thus it fell out that the Gospel

became a Code. As a famous Latin race has its Code Napoleon, so has Latin Christianity its *Code Jesus Christ*.

Two facts may be further named as illustrations. As the Western Church grew it provided itself with a special body of Law and an apparatus of Canons, Decretals, Decisions, which has grown to vast dimensions. Again, a system of casuistry has been developed, which is an elaborate attempt to codify morals. So again in Calvin, the most vigorous and logical of the Reformers, we recognise the same type of theology.

Practically the same bent may be detected in a characteristic Latin product—the Schoolmen (though I am far from supposing that this exhausts the significance of the scholastic movement)—the grammarians of theology, who like a corps of ecclesiastical surveyors went, map and compass in hand, over the whole field of religious thought, marking out routes, laying down fences, erecting danger-signals, and, while they adjusted the old, developing new dogmas, new rules, devising fresh sacraments.

The Latin faith, said Mommsen, speaking of Pagan Rome, sought to form distinct conceptions, to assign to them a terminology, to classify them into a system. So in Christian theology, the practical Latin mind will not rest until it has

mapped out in minute detail that Purgatorial world about which Hellenism was so wisely reticent.

Dante's poem is, in fact, a Handbook to the Unseen. It is an unofficial guide-book, certainly, but it illustrates the Western anxiety to realise everything, even the invisible.

The Poet-Theologian can tell you as much of the City of Pluto as of the City of Florence; he can describe every street and alley and path.

When men profess to know, or believe that they know, so much that is hidden from the crowd, the passion is generated at once for rule and for uniformity—a desire to display the hard-won and mysterious knowledge; to compel, if necessary, assent, and by this knowledge to govern.

So vigorous and yet so narrow was Latin centralisation that the Western Church has always laid stress on verbal unity. Her clergy must always say the same thing, in the same language, with the same ceremonial.

How dear to Latin instincts is this external conformity may be seen from the story of the French Minister of Education, who takes out his watch and says, "At this hour every schoolboy in France is saying the same lesson." By this instinct every French dependency becomes a little France in miniature, as every National Church is forced to adopt the model of Rome.

It would be an error to suppose (as noticed) that the Hellenists, because they first theorised about the faith, were as narrowly dogmatic as the Latins. Even here the distinction is clear: the Greek mind loves to speculate, while the Latin must weigh and measure, and accordingly has carried its rule and compass into regions the Greek dogmatist has left untouched.

The Latin mind could not rest, and cannot to this day, till it sees everything in black and white; till every opinion is duly labelled; till every pigeon-hole is duly filled, every dark corner lighted up. While the East remains wisely content with the first six Councils, her Western sister has gone on defining and defining;* has not merely propounded new creeds, but has inserted a new clause in the so-called Nicene, which has cost her dear. The insertion of the '*Hilioque*' in the Creed gratified two Western instincts at once—the love of symmetry and of definition (if the Son be very God, why should He not be exactly as the Father?). We have seen in our own day two new articles of faith added to the list of *Credenda*—the Immaculate Conception and Infallibility of the Pope. At and after the Reforma-

* That the Latin Church has never defined *authoritatively* the two great questions of Inspiration or human Destiny is very remarkable.

tion epoch Articles of Faith were framed by the dozen in the various newly-fledged communities, dealing in detail with points that never troubled the great Eastern teachers.

A Nemesis has followed in the West. Seeking an absolute certainty in every detail the Schoolmen shrank from no discussion. Everything was, as it were, flung into the ecclesiastical melting-pot; everything became, in a word, debateable where everything was, in fact, debated. But, further, a vast system of Rationalism sprang in practice from the Latin dread of Reason—*e.g.*, the mutilation of the Holy Communion by withholding the cup on grounds purely rationalistic; the whole theory and practice of Indulgences, &c.

Latin Realism, which in the first Western Doctor, Tertullian, assigned without hesitation a body to God, persisted in the West, though in form less crude, it must have something it could see, and touch, and handle, must have at least a visible Head and Pontiff. And as the weight and pressure of ecclesiastical questions grew, so the Latin mind, impatient of indecision, has always been attracted to the idea of infallibility.

And this idea once admitted, no other solution was really possible than to localise this infallibility where Christ's Vicar was seated. To all this yet another factor

contributed, *i.e.*, the Western tendency to place God at a distance, to substitute for the Immanent Deity of the Hellenist, the *Deus absconditus* of the Oriental (verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself), thus a Pope at hand was a compensation for a God afar off.

In pointing out as above the harsh and sombre relation which obtained between the old Roman and his gods and which has passed into Western Christianity, I have indicated the facts but partially. The relation between the old Latin and the Deities he venerated was largely a mercantile one. The sacrifice of the Roman was due to self-interest, and the prayer attending it was a bargain.

The similarity of Latinism in not a few points to the Oriental type is a fact to which I shall call attention later on ; here we are reminded of the close parallel between this feature and the prayer of Jacob.* The gods confronted the old Roman much as a debtor does his creditors, he paid his debt, whether mercantile or religious, in much the same spirit—nay, sometimes overpaid his religious debt—which tendency has its theological parallel in works of supererogation.

Not a little light is thus thrown on the developments of mediæval theology. The Pardoners, who roused the ire of Luther,

* Genesis xxviii. 20-22,

and kindled that flame which burst into a conflagration, in selling the Church's forgiveness by a fixed tariff were following a racial instinct.

The Mediæval book* can still be read, with scale annexed and carefully adjusted, by which remission can be obtained, not merely, it would seem, for the temporal punishment due to sin, but, to use the words of Pope Boniface VIII., "most full remission of all sins" can be had. The taxes are graduated with skill and care, and the extent to which this vile traffic went can only be adequately understood by those who have devoted special study to an unsavoury matter. The Church holds the keys of a vast treasury, and will open the doors, always at a price!

The Western Church, like any trader, has her tariff; she is banker, and keeps her customers' accounts. She is mistress of a great ecclesiastical counting-house, where guilt is priced, where sins are duly ticketed, and merits can be transferred. She has her array of altars, where the indulgences that may be gained and the terms offered are duly listed. Sin and Grace become matters of book-keeping. It is natural to suspect the trading instincts of the Carthaginian as reappearing here and asserting themselves in Latin theology.

* Taxes of the Apostolical Penitentiary, Dublin, 1872.

Nor are these tendencies Papal merely ; they are Latin and Western, they are common in spirit to many Anglicans, and Nonconformists and to the Pope. In abandoning Rome we have remained Latin at heart. Our protest against her errors has left us still at bottom enamoured of Latin ideals.

By a fiction, a sin of Adam which I have never committed is "*imputed*" to me ; an entry is then, as it were, made, and my account with the Church is debited with so much guilt. Having begun so auspiciously, the Church proceeds to adjust the scale by placing to my credit a merit which is not mine. I sin by proxy, by proxy I am saved. You can, it is hardly too much to say, thus deal as on a celestial stock exchange. Whether it be the merit of some saint or of the King of saints, the principle is the same.

This idea of surplus or spare merit in its simplest form meets us very early in the Latin Church. "If you can do something in addition to what Christ commands, you will gain more honour and dignity than you would otherwise have obtained.* Here is a significant and very interesting light thrown on Latin methods and conceptions. If I lay up merit may I not transfer it? was a conclusion almost certain to be

*Hermas. Simil v. 3. Cyprian has the same idea —De Lapsis.

reached, and soon reached in fact, as Western theological literature shows.

Even our evangelical friends have not been saved by their zeal against Rome from this ingrained Western tendency. As I write, Mr. Gladstone* points out how this party give to the great saving operation of the Gospel "the air of a bargain in a shop, in which one passes a coin across the counter and receives a commodity in exchange."

Seldom has the irony of history been more complete. Nearly four hundred years after the revolt from the scandal of trafficking in pardons we see that the most vigorous Protestors have not got the Gospel out of the precincts of the shop and *the coin passed across the counter!* We have sinned, and—so to speak—God gives a receipt in full—value received—on the Cross!—so persistent are Latin tendencies.

The Latin races of to-day show themselves scions of Rome in a point which has a painful interest theologically. Popular historians like Creasy remark freely on "the savage brutality that deforms the national Roman character." "Coarse and brutal" Romans is the verdict of Professor Mahaffy—words more than justified when we remember the arena and its hideous sports, where women were outraged on the stage, where they fought naked in public;

* Evangelical Magazine, December, 1894.

where criminals were publicly mutilated; where Hercules was literally burnt alive and Orpheus torn limb from limb* ; where it was the *privilege* of the vestal virgin to give the sign and watch the sword driven deep into the palpitating entrails.

Titus, "the *joy and pride of the human race*," having crucified Jews by the thousand, exposed their women and children in the public games to be torn by wild beasts. The gentle Gordian provided 1,000 pairs of gladiators for his triumph. Trajan, one of the best of the Roman emperors, gave 123 holidays, on which 10,000 combatants slaughtered themselves as a pastime. Roman law permitted a debtor to be cut in pieces. Tertullian tells us that almost down to his day the Latin Jupiter was appeased by human blood, whether at Carthage or at Rome is not quite clear from his words.†

St. Ambrose‡ speaks of flogging a slave to death in terms which seem to show that it was not very uncommon. Tatian shows that human sacrifices to Jupiter and to Artemis existed in his day.§ Crucifixion was the death penalty commonly awarded to a slave.

It is easy to reply that Christianity would tend to soften all this. That is

* Ozanam Hist. de la civ. i. 87, i. 216. Cf. Tert. Apol. 15. † Adv. Gnost. 7. ‡ De Nab. v. § Ad. Grec. 29.

true; but there is something quite as true and often forgotten—that Roman cruelty *would harden its Christianity*. And this is still more true when we remember that the theology of the West was Carthaginian as well as Latin, was nursed on a soil and by a race still more cruel than the Roman.

The Roman father was a despot empowered to expose his children and possessing the right to confiscate all their earnings, or to put them to death, even when grown up, by any punishment he pleased. It was more difficult to emancipate a son than a slave. A man's wife was by a curious provision her husband's daughter, practically his chattel (*res*).

The tenacity of life shown by the *patria potestas* for long centuries in Roman history is remarkable. The Roman State was an agglomeration of petty despotisms. There were as many of these as there were households. A wife at Rome is said to have been put to death by starvation for merely opening the wine-cellar (*Tert. Apol.* 6, copying the story from Pliny, who in turn takes it from Fabius Pictor).

Nay, we can see the hardening process, as, *e.g.*, in the passage above quoted from Tertullian. If any one cares to read the whole context he can gain some insight into the reaction on Christianity of racial cruelty and brutality. The course of

Latin Christianity bears out all this; its history is stained with blood. Not many centuries passed before its divines began to clamour for the death of heretics, and soon converted into practice their theories. Augustine steadily and deliberately advocated religious persecution, as his matured theology shows.* Such a race naturally founded the Inquisition.

Instinctively we ask, What chance had the conception of a God who is Love in such hands as these? Through such channels has Western theology filtered down to us. We are to-day drinking of wells which Latin and Carthaginian cruelty has tainted.

Such a theology inevitably reverts to fear as a basis. Its God tends to become a Cæsar, an Autocrat of all the Heavens, who issues ukases to a nation of serfs. This is *in essence* the Augustinian conception stripped of fine phrases. His God decrees in pursuance of "most occult justice" (words wide enough to cover anything) Hell or Heaven as He pleases. Soon Augustine's "occult justice" became Calvin's "horrible decree." In reverting to sin and fear and penalty as bases of theology, the Latin Church was going back to primitive racial ideas, but was deserting the central conception of the Gospel—"Love." Such a basis might have

* Ep. 93, 97, 173, 185. C. Gaudi.

been pagan or Semitic—Christian it was not.

It is curious to find Polybius noticing this fear of future punishment in his day as exercising a potent influence over the Romans, and to notice in exactly the same spirit the first of the Carthaginian divines striking that note which has dominated all Latin Christianity. FEAR, says Tertullian, is the means of procuring repentance—no fear, no amendment.*

These conceptions of the Divine Being and this fear of incurring His wrath in turn reacted on secular life. Vengeance received a new sanction, revenge and cruelty were almost canonised.

Disastrous consequences were felt everywhere—in Law, in Morals, in Politics; consequences outweighing far that gleam of light which may be detected at the bottom of these painful views of God—viz., a deeper sense of sin than Hellenism possessed, a stronger realisation of the certainty of Judgment to come. Meantime, while the Carthaginians were enlarging on the Divine wrath as at once most real and most vindictive, Clement of Alexandria was ridiculing the notion that God was really angry, "*like a little old hag!*" as he puts it. Nor do I contend here that the Carthaginians were wholly wrong and the Alexandrians wholly right; it is enough to

* De Pen. 2.

point out how *infinite* is the difference between the two theologies.

Latinism from the first is disposed to lay special stress on the Atonement. To satisfy and appease the irresponsible Ruler is the first necessity. We are struck with the references even of Clement of Rome to the blood of Christ. We notice Tertullian asserting that the Death of our Lord (not His Incarnation) is the central fact of Christianity, on it reposes the whole weight of the Christian scheme.*

Where fear is the basis of religion, the Incarnation will always, in practice, recede into the background. For that is a confession of near kinship between man and God which is not consistent with terror before an angry Judge. In such a theology man shrinks from God. God's wrath must be appeased. He must receive '*satisfaction*,' a victim must be offered. Blood must flow. Such ideas are the commonplaces of Latin theology. I do not mean to deny that elements of truth exist in the Latin conception, but it seized on that which is at best but secondary, and made it the pivot of Christianity.

Let us examine this weighty matter a little further. Not alone was the due proportion of faith lost by depressing the Incarnation, but a wrong view of the

* C. Marc. iii. 8.

death of Christ followed. Thus Latin Realism, with an instinct intelligible to those who have followed its antecedents, revelled in the *material aspects* of the Atonement, e.g., in "the red wounds* streaming" of a popular hymn, in the blood, which by a further development is taken up into Heaven—there on the Celestial Altar to turn away the anger of God and win His favour.

The nobler part of the Sacrifice is lost, the spiritual elements are not denied, but overshadowed. The magnetic force and universal range and efficacy of that Love is forgotten which said: 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw (*drag, hale*, literally) all men unto Me.'

Two consequences have resulted. Where the Deity has to be placated a priest is needed with special privileges and special powers. Thus Propitiation and Sacerdotalism are akin. A creed resting on the idea of appeasing God tends to create a priestly caste. Therefore it is to be remarked as more than a coincidence that in Cyprian, who is so strongly sacerdotal in tone, the references are very numerous to the need there exists of placating God.

A further result is this: where the material element in Sacrifice becomes

* Just as a kindred thought has led the Roman Catholic Church to the modern cult of the material heart of Jesus.

Latin Christianity bears out all this; its history is stained with blood. Not many centuries passed before its divines began to clamour for the death of heretics, and soon converted into practice their theories. Augustine steadily and deliberately advocated religious persecution, as his matured theology shows.* Such a race naturally founded the Inquisition.

Instinctively we ask, What chance had the conception of a God who is Love in such hands as these? Through such channels has Western theology filtered down to us. We are to-day drinking of wells which Latin and Carthaginian cruelty has tainted.

Such a theology inevitably reverts to fear as a basis. Its God tends to become a Cæsar, an Autocrat of all the Heavens, who issues ukases to a nation of serfs. This is *in essence* the Augustinian conception stripped of fine phrases. His God decrees in pursuance of "most occult justice" (words wide enough to cover anything) Hell or Heaven as He pleases. Soon Augustine's "occult justice" became Calvin's "horrible decree." In reverting to sin and fear and penalty as bases of theology, the Latin Church was going back to primitive racial ideas, but was deserting the central conception of the Gospel—"Love." Such a basis might have

* Ep. 93, 97, 173, 185. C. Gaudi.

been pagan or Semitic—Christian it was not.

It is curious to find Polybius noticing this fear of future punishment in his day as exercising a potent influence over the Romans, and to notice in exactly the same spirit the first of the Carthaginian divines striking that note which has dominated all Latin Christianity. FEAR, says Tertulian, is the means of procuring repentance—no fear, no amendment.*

These conceptions of the Divine Being and this fear of incurring His wrath in turn reacted on secular life. Vengeance received a new sanction, revenge and cruelty were almost canonised.

Disastrous consequences were felt everywhere—in Law, in Morals, in Politics; consequences outweighing far that gleam of light which may be detected at the bottom of these painful views of God—viz., a deeper sense of sin than Hellenism possessed, a stronger realisation of the certainty of Judgment to come. Meantime, while the Carthaginians were enlarging on the Divine wrath as at once most real and most vindictive, Clement of Alexandria was ridiculing the notion that God was really angry, "*like a little old hag!*" as he puts it. Nor do I contend here that the Carthaginians were wholly wrong and the Alexandrians wholly right; it is enough to

* De Pen. 2.

point out how *infinite* is the difference between the two theologies.

Latinism from the first is disposed to lay special stress on the Atonement. To satisfy and appease the irresponsible Ruler is the first necessity. We are struck with the references even of Clement of Rome to the blood of Christ. We notice Tertullian asserting that the Death of our Lord (not His Incarnation) is the central fact of Christianity, on it reposes the whole weight of the Christian scheme.*

Where fear is the basis of religion, the Incarnation will always, in practice, recede into the background. For that is a confession of near kinship between man and God which is not consistent with terror before an angry Judge. In such a theology man shrinks from God. God's wrath must be appeased. He must receive '*satisfaction*,' a victim must be offered. Blood must flow. Such ideas are the commonplaces of Latin theology. I do not mean to deny that elements of truth exist in the Latin conception, but it seized on that which is at best but secondary, and made it the pivot of Christianity.

Let us examine this weighty matter a little further. Not alone was the due proportion of faith lost by depressing the Incarnation, but a wrong view of the

* C. Marc. iii. 8.

death of Christ followed. Thus Latin Realism, with an instinct intelligible to those who have followed its antecedents, revelled in the *material aspects* of the Atonement, e.g., in "the red wounds* streaming" of a popular hymn, in the blood, which by a further development is taken up into Heaven—there on the Celestial Altar to turn away the anger of God and win His favour.

The nobler part of the Sacrifice is lost, the spiritual elements are not denied, but overshadowed. The magnetic force and universal range and efficacy of that Love is forgotten which said: 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw (*drag, hale*, literally) all men unto Me."

Two consequences have resulted. Where the Deity has to be placated a priest is needed with special privileges and special powers. Thus Propitiation and Sacerdotalism are akin. A creed resting on the idea of appeasing God tends to create a priestly caste. Therefore it is to be remarked as more than a coincidence that in Cyprian, who is so strongly sacerdotal in tone, the references are very numerous to the need there exists of placating God.

A further result is this: where the material element in Sacrifice becomes

* Just as a kindred thought has led the Roman Catholic Church to the modern cult of the material heart of Jesus.

prominent, the purely ethical side is depressed, a tendency arises to a system of Dualism. The conscience and moral sense have no real *locus standi* at the bar of Heaven. Justice becomes *occult* and morality *regulative* in Dean Mansel's phrase, which, adroit as it is, conceals an abyss. Two standards of right and wrong are thus indirectly sanctioned—two Kingdoms of Grace and of Nature, and so on. We are almost or quite landed—practically—in Dualism, which is ever the inner meaning of Pessimism.

Hence it is easy to understand the complacency with which Latin Christianity views the perpetuation of evil in the universe. Nor is it satisfied by teaching a schism in the very nature of God—a schism between His attributes* of Justice and Mercy: we find a further dualism in popular Christianity encouraged and widespread, if not always formally authorised.

This dualism, while springing from the same root, takes two forms. In the Anglican† and Nonconformist version it asserts that our Lord changes from a loving Saviour to an angry Judge after a certain date. In the Roman Catholic rendering the legend takes a different and

* Has God really that which theology calls *attributes*?

† So Keble—Hymn Third Sunday after Easter.

characteristic shape — here a furious Christ is appeased by a loving Mother.

I am able to give an excellent illustration. Close to where I write this—in Italy—there is a fresco where our Lord in great wrath brandishes a scourge, but is held back by his Mother. Underneath are these words:* Calm, O my Son, Thy righteous fury. *I am the sinner's advocate.*

An attempt has been already made to show that (ch. iii.) there is not a little in Latin Christianity to remind us that in its development it was exposed to Semitic influences. I do not know if this has received due attention; yet to whatever it may be traced the points of resemblance between the Latin and Oriental mind are numerous, and are of sufficient interest, theologically and historically, to be noticed here briefly.

I. The Oriental sense of Fate appears unmistakably in that rigid Predestinarianism which is really the climax of the Augustinian theology (which spread so rapidly in the West), in his deepest thought the greatest Latin doctor is Oriental. Both theories are expressions of belief in an Arbitrary Power, who controls all destinies, often according to rules no human equity can accept. This idea pervades the entire later theology of Augustine—of

* Calma, O figlio, i tuoi giusti furori;
L'avvocata son io de peccatori.

whom Calvin is hardly more than an echo.

II. As the Oriental hails the prophet or bends before the tyrant, so the Latin welcomes a dictator. Obeying this tendency, the Oriental idea of government has never risen above the level of a despotism, which in Latinism reappears in the Papacy. It is curious to find the first early Pope who bears a Latin name—Victor—the first to try and play the tyrant.

III. The religious wars of the Old Testament and those of Mahometanism find a parallel in more than one painful chapter of ecclesiastical story in the Latin Church. The War-god was the chief Latin deity; and in the Jewish theology God was Lord of armies; the very name Israel appears to mean "God fighteth."

IV. Oriental faiths, as a rule, repose on entire prostration of mind and ready acceptance of anything on authority. The same feeling we find in Latinism as early as Tertullian, who flouts and scoffs at reason. Roman Catholic and Lutheran agree on this point. Luther's apostrophe to Reason, *Du scäbige hure!* is best left untranslated. The same tendency reappears in Pascal, who calmly owns that what he advocates is folly. "*C'est une folie mais on le donne pour telle.*" It is amusing, then, but hardly surprising, to find Mr.

Mozley virtually persuading himself that if he call a dogma a "mystery" it becomes entitled to exemption from the demands of justice and equity. In our own day men like Kidd and Balfour share with Newman this dislike to reason in matters of faith.

V. In a nobler characteristic Latin and Semite, at least the Jew, agree—in their love of action as distinguished from the Hellenistic love of thinking—of doing rather than of speculating. To both the Latin and the Jew abstract thought is unwelcome as a rule, and metaphysical theories are by them little cultivated.

VI. The legal tendency, again, is a common feature in Semitism and in Latinism; both loved to codify and to systematise. To the Latin the Gospel was a new law, while to the Hellenist it was a new philosophy. Mosaism was in its essence a law; and in their later history the Jews had in their Mishna a sort of anticipation of Western scholasticism, and in the Rabbis a corps of schoolmen. Jewish theology is essentially a jurisprudence. Brahminism is a vast system of legalism, where a network of fixed rules exists under which each act of life is guided from birth to the grave.

VII. Again, Oriental and Latin thought agree in a low view of man, in placing an abyss between the human and the Divine,

in a tendency to cruel punishments ; both conspicuously are deficient in that humanitarianism which is so marked in Hellenism.

VIII. A certain toughness of character marks the Latin and the Semite, a strenuous ferocity—well exemplified in that final siege of Jerusalem where both races met in a death-struggle. Still the Jew lives on, outlasts all storms, defies all deaths, a toughness paralleled in the Latin Papacy, in the *Eternal City*.

IX. In both Latin and Oriental we can trace a mercantile view of religion. Of this tendency in Latinism enough has been said. I will merely add that a representative Latin book like Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* is pervaded by this commercial tone.

X. A strong sense of sin and a stress laid on Expiation are common features of Latin and Semitic systems. We have seen how a fear of future penalty weighed on the Latin, while yet heathen. Even to-day to the Jew the chief religious event of the year is the Day of Atonement.

XI. It is perhaps worth notice that in a conception so dear to Latin theology as the idea of Supererogation we have a Semitic, at least a Jewish belief, for this was in substance taught by the Pharisees.*

XII. Both Latin and Oriental coincide

* Gfrörer *Das Jahr des Heils*, i. 37.

in a tendency to Pessimistic thought.*
 “Ad astra *doloribus* itur.”—By pains heaven is won, says one of the oldest Latin Christian poets; a feeling ever recurring, which à Kempis re-echoes when he calls life *miserrima*, which even in so noble a psalm as the ninetieth finds expression, which the Preacher more vividly utters in his wail, “Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.” To both Brahmin and Buddhist life is in its essence evil; to escape life and thought is deliverance and bliss.

XIII. Latin and Oriental systems agree in a leaning to aristocracy or autocracy; only a class or caste are favoured, the mass are of no value. As the Oriental king raises any one from the mire whom his caprice selects, exactly so does the God of Augustine draw from the miry mass of sinners those whom His caprice elects as heaven’s favourites. I have noticed the Oriental readiness to welcome the prophet. This may explain why Tertullian, in the bosom of a Church so

* Those who wish to see the really terrible depths to which Latin Pessimism can descend are invited to study the following words, in which Arnobius in the fourth century describes man’s creation, and to whose gloomy despair and cynicism it would be hard to find anywhere in ali literature a parallel:—*Qui nullâ aliâ de causâ sese intelligat procreatum quam ne materiem non haberent per quam diffunderent se mala, et essent miseri semper, quorum cruciatibus pasceretur nescio quæ vis latens et humanitati adversa crudelitas.*—*C. Gent. ii. 45.*

sacerdotal as the Latin, leans so strongly to the prophetic, *i.e.*, the lay* element in Christianity. Thus in Oriental countries when the prophet appears everything is forgotten. Even distinctions of sex so powerful to the Eastern mind tend to vanish. Witness Miriam and Deborah and Huldah in the Old Testament, and Tertullian's Maximilla and her sister prophetesses.

XIV. Finally, in the Oriental tendency of the Western Church we find the best explanation of that appeal to the Old Testament rather than the New which characterises at once Geneva and Rome.

Some of these coincidences between Latin and Oriental are significant; some may, perhaps, be otherwise explained; but the general resemblance seems clear and of considerable importance theologically—when the genesis of Latin theology is remembered.

Perhaps the true affinities of Latinism can best be seen by tracing its course a little further, and taking a few representa-

* Some may prefer to see in this an unconscious Nemesis—a reaction from extreme views by which narrowness corrects itself, as in the parallel case we find even in Augustine, who carried Church theories to an extreme, very *distinct* traces of a belief in an invisible and celestial body as the genuine Church of Christ. The same is true even of Tertullian “*una ecclesia in cœlis*,” *De Bap. xv. cf. c. viii.*, and of Cyprian, “*multi sunt in sacramentorum communione et jam non sunt in ecclesiâ.*”—*De unit.*

tive names at a time late enough to show its inherent tendencies in a developed state. Take, *e.g.*, the famous *Cur Deus homo*. Anselm wrote in the eleventh century, when the human intellect was becoming conscious of its claims to respect. He writes as one who recognises that there were those who would not believe except their reason was satisfied.* Reason has been ousted by Faith, but now cries in plaintive tones, "Hast Thou but one blessing? Bless me, even me, O my Father."

It is this undertone, this minor chord which runs through Anselm, that gives the truest interest to his pages. Half yielding to it, he rises for a moment or two to a true Hellenism,† and says not merely that God has made nothing more precious than man's reasonable nature, but that it is completely foreign to God to permit any reasonable creature to perish wholly, and that it is God's purpose to restore the human race. But Anselm *means* nothing of the sort; these are words, empty words, *purpurei panni*, sophistries of which few writings are fuller, sometimes in an extravagant form.

See the amazing logic-chopping of *ch. ix. lib. ii.* If the Father had become incarnate there would have been two grandsons (!) *nepotes* in the Trinity, and if

* *Cur D. H. i. 2.* † *e.g. lib. ii. 4.*

any other than the Son had been incarnate, then two Sons would have been in the Trinity! A stony creed it is that Anselm offers to the reasonable nature, to the heart and conscience that will not be stilled in its cry for bread—God's intention in creating man is really to repair the void caused by the Fall of the Angels and to complete the City of God.—*i. 16, 18, 19.*

The lost are, as it were, but the chips and refuse that have proved useless in this task of repair. The refuse naturally go to Hell, although Anselm does not deny that more may be saved than are needed to fill up the gap in Heaven. All this is bad enough, but Anselm has worse in store. Nothing illustrates better the depth to which Latin Christianity had now sunk than Anselm's assertion that it is *not possible for God freely to forgive man.*

It is *tit for tat*, to borrow a homely phrase, between God and man. It is a blow for a blow. God's *honour (!)*, so we are gravely told, must be preserved—*i.e.*, God, like a Shylock, must have His pound of flesh. God, like a mediæval noble, stands on *punctilio*. Man in sinning has robbed God of something, therefore God must have "*satisfaction.*" This is all the more perplexing because Anselm admits that God cannot really be deprived of anything.

It is a strange and significant fact that

Anselm nowhere thinks of showing how an Incarnation is practicable on the lines of his theology. How two beings who stand so far apart as man and God can become one he nowhere explains. It is the familiar Latin standpoint over again: the Celestial Autocrat and the human Serf, who cannot amalgamate in reality. Behind Anselm stand Augustine and Tertullian; the hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob.

There are few more mournful books or more typical. The tone of self-satisfaction that, beneath a veil of, perhaps, genuine humility pervades his argument; his confidence, Latin-like, that he can put everything in black and white; that "nothing," to borrow his own phrase, "more reasonable" can be adduced or thought, is characteristic. Anselm's conclusions rest largely on that which we must call an approach to blasphemy, for if blasphemy be possible, then to say that God *cannot forgive freely* is to wound God in the tenderest place.

And this mortal blow dealt to God's character is dealt, as I have said, under the plea of respect for His honour. This vindictive and punctilious God, who will not forego His rights though endless agony and endless evil result to unnumbered millions, is at bottom one of the most repulsive and the most mis-

chievous pictures which theology has drawn. The open dualism between Justice and Mercy, the commercial relation between God and man, the callous tone, the sham appeal to Reason, the sad fiasco in which Creation ends—all this I commend to the notice of students of Latinism.

Anselm is like one trying to smile when draped in funeral trappings, trying to base a reasonable creed on premises that are a denial of reason, trying to walk erect when bound and fettered. Fully admitting what there is of noble in the design and in the author, you feel that the schoolman has swallowed up the man. You perceive the underlying despair. You resent the constant sophisms—it is well if you do not take refuge in unbelief.

From Anselm to Dante is but a step—to the great Florentine who has translated into the vernacular the current theology of his day. The hardness of the Latin type stands revealed in vivid colours; the poet's perfect complacency while describing the torments of the Inferno mars his art, and degrades noble verse by ignoble themes.

Dante furnishes us with a solitary instance of one of the world's greatest poems disfigured by a love of cruelty and a vindictiveness typically Italian. The "trail of the serpent" is over it all, and I do not pretend to envy the reader who, amid the ravishments of the Paradiso, is led to

forget the ghastly pains of Dante's Inferno, and not that merely, but the poet's enjoyment while he writes of these. It seems as if the softest cadences of such as Dante are *feline* rather than genuinely tender; as if the wail of lost souls tossing in hopeless agony were distinctly heard in every corner of his Paradise.

Or let us take a higher example of Latin Christianity than Dante can furnish. How narrow and even callous in its intensity is the devotion of the *Imitatio Christi*. Dante's saints revel in the vision of God unmoved by the thought of sympathy with the lost as they toss for ever on fiery billows—is the spirit of Kempis *at bottom* greatly different? The genuine devoutness of tone must not blind us to the underlying selfishness. Not once does à Kempis call God Father. Man is a serf, a degraded little worm. So common is this selfishness* and callousness in Western devotion that it seems natural to find Aquinas at one pole and Baxter at the other, yet agreed in thinking that the torments of the lost do but heighten by contrast the bliss of Paradise, of Paradise fallen to a degradation lower than even that of Mahomet.

Let us select yet another Western type. A great German hymnist cannot exclude from a hymn, otherwise charming in

* Once à Kempis prays for friends and foes.—ii. 8.

tone, this callousness. I subjoin a literal rendering :

Wenn *Ich* Ihn nur habe
Wenn Er *Mein* nur ist

* * * * *

Ich *lasse still die anderen*
Breite lichte volle strasse wandern.

If I only have Him,

If He only be mine,

I quietly allow the rest (of men)

To wander along the broad, bright, frequented road.

If *I* only escape, the rest may go to perdition—is this *in essence* an unfair rendering of Novalis' *latent thought*?

A final illustration may be furnished by one who is Augustinian—*pur sang*. In Pascal's gloom and austerity, in his thorough-going pessimism, we have a characteristic Latin type. One great service not always noticed he has rendered: his clear intellect cuts through the set phrases (in which we still hear theologians disguising the true meaning of endless damnation) which assert that sufficient grace for salvation is given to all.

“La grace suffisante, Mon Pere, *c'est la grace que ne suffit pas*.” What you call *sufficient* grace my good Father, is grace not sufficient *in fact* to save. Pascal, as he looks at life, seems to have one dominant cry—“O the barren, barren moorland, O the dreary, dreary shore!” Half despairing, half believing, he clings to his dark creed, self-tortured, a figure at once heroic and pathetic.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY.

1

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY.

WE are now in a position to sum up our comparison of the rival theologies whose pedigrees we have been investigating. As in English political life, all observers see the working of two great parties who seek a common object indeed, but by different paths and in pursuance of different 'ruling ideas,' so in the theology of the first four centuries all competent observers see two great parties, two distinct and even conflicting renderings of the Gospel.

It may be conceded that in practice the line of cleavage between Latins and Hellenists is not always sharply drawn, nor can the boundary of the respective territories be laid down in all details as on a map; in all human affairs the mental workings of men sometimes defy exact analysis. To all our generalisations some objections occur, but we do not therefore cease to generalise.

No one doubts the metaphysical leanings of the Hellenist, and the general indifference of the Latin to speculation.

Yet the Latins produced the greatest philosophical poem of antiquity, and a Latin is the greatest metaphysician of all the Fathers.

Conservative and Liberal represent in politics two distinct and even opposed poles of thought, yet there are men who have their mental homes in both camps—there are Liberal-Conservatives. The Latin mind has tended to slight philosophy. This will be admitted, yet in Victorinus (Afer), in Synesius, in Erigena the Latin Church produced the three most typical Neo-Platonists of the Fathers.

Nor do I seek to deny that Latinism and Hellenism are related; but so are Brahmanism and Buddhism as systems of thought; so are Chinese and Japanese men of kindred type, yet how great is the difference. There are men, *e.g.*, Ezekiel and Samuel, in whom priest and prophet are united, yet how opposed are the priestly and prophetic ideals.

In both cases, too, there are side currents so to speak, there are eddies in both political and religious thought, there are shades of opinion in abundance, there are individuals, and even small groups, whose exact standpoint it is not always easy to define. There are some few Hellenists who Latinise as there are Latins who Hellenise, there are a few divines who cross occasionally from one camp to the other.

But, on the whole, no fact in theological history is clearer, and no fact more important and yet more generally neglected, than the broad distinction between the Hellenism, which is the common basis of the various Eastern schools of theology for at least three or four centuries, and the theology of North Africa (and Spain), which, grafted on the Roman stock, became the parent of Latin Christianity, and is to this day, in its spirit at least, an accepted legal tender in the whole West.

When every fair allowance has been made, Latinism and Hellenism differ intellectually, differ ethically, differ spiritually. The starting-point differs, the conclusion differs, the atmosphere differs, the idiom differs, and often when they use the same words they accentuate them differently.

To cease "lumping" Latin and Hellene under a common denomination ("the Fathers") as teachers virtually identical, is an essential preliminary to any just idea of primitive theology, is indispensable before any serious effort can be made to meet the spiritual needs of a large and growing class, both inside the Church and outside its fold, who are unable to accept many current traditions, who aspire and will continue to aspire after a theology which, not merely calls itself, but which is truly Catholic and reasonable.

Hellenism had from the first its spiritual standards, its measures of weight and capacity wholly divergent from Latin theology. How real was this divergence has been shown at length, but may be further illustrated in many details. The Hellenistic churches formed a federation, while the Latin tended by natural instincts to a despotism. Latinism was Proconsular and its motto *Imperium*. Hellenism was Republican, and its device was *Libertas*. The first Latin virtue was obedience, while to the Hellenist the first was love.

Two contradictory principles divided Latinism and Hellenism; substantially the former was built on God's claims on man, the latter in large measure on man's claims on God and on the assurance that those claims will be fully allowed.

The Latin mind was receptive, the Hellenistic was constructive; the latter were philosophers, while the Latins were rhetoricians or lawyers and scorned philosophy. "What has a philosopher in common with a Christian?" asks the founder of the Carthaginian School. While Clement of Alexandria holds Plato to be divinely inspired, Tertullian calls him the seasoning of all heretics.*

The two systems stand contrasted as Cesarism and Intuitionism. I might almost say one is the State *versus* the

* De Animâ xxiii.

man, the other is the man *versus* the State.

To the Hellenists the ultimate appeal is to the *forum conscientiae*, or to reason, while the Latins alike in religion and in politics "appeal unto Cæsar."

The one places first the goodness of God, the other His power. The one reveres force, and the other fair play in God.

While the Latin motto was the law, the Hellenistic device was the Logos—a term of which the wholly inadequate rendering in our English New Testament as "Word" is to be regretted. It is impossible, I venture to say, to read the early Hellenistic theologians and not feel that they meant by this term something far more than the Word of God. They meant the Divine Wisdom, or Reason, *speaking* to man as himself also a reasonable (*logical*) being. They designed to emphasize this fellowship of man and God, to dwell on the *permanence* of this spiritual tie or bond. Without an adequate recognition of this fact, no true conception of the Hellenistic standpoint is possible.

Far different was the Latin point of view. When Professor Harnack tells us of the vast significance to Latin Christianity, which is involved in its early theologians being a jurist like Tertullian and a priestly ruler like Cyprian, we must

not mistake the true meaning of such facts. Latin Christianity did not become legal and sacerdotal because of Tertullian and Cyprian, for these men were children of their age; they were products of a bent already existing in the race; if they led they also followed.

To the Hellenist Christ is the Head of every man and Root of humanity, which forms one organic whole; while to the Latin Adam is head, and humanity is separable and inorganic. The solidarity of mankind is in sin merely, and not in redemption, and so, *in fact*, the Latin Church's message of glad tidings to the race of man has wanted the accents of certainty, perhaps of sincerity.

Indeed, universal redemption is, in a sense, merely theoretical or potential to the Latin Church. The most eminent Latin teacher went so far that he denied* Christ's dying for all men—a most suggestive fact.

To the Hellenist God and man are so nearly related that God can, in the words of the Gospel, *become* man—not merely *assume* or *adopt* a man. As a result, the Incarnation is a natural, rather than a merely mysterious fact, as it seems to the Latin mind.

* See the passage in Augustine, *De Conj. Adul.*, i. 15. Besides this sentence there is abundant other proof of this father's view.

. And hence an explanation is found for the phrase occurring in certain Hellenistic writers which states *deification* as the goal of humanity, *i.e.*, God becomes man in order that man may become God.

For other reasons, in fact, but also because of this close kindred of man and God, the Hellenist laid little stress on propitiating the Deity, which in Latin Christianity is so prominent a thought. The Hellenist's hope was immortality—the Latin's was escape from penalty.

The idea of the Divine Fatherhood was welcome to the Hellenist, even though not so prominent in their theology as that of the Logos, but we hear a distinguished Latin father* declaring the idea to be not untrue merely, but horrible and wicked.

Hellenism is self-respect, while Latinism is self-contempt. To the former, human nature is a reflection of the Divine; while the latter is disposed to make the Divine the mirror of man's lower nature, of his anger, his caprice, his thirst for vengeance. It may seem a verbal distinction, but it is in truth far more—whether a theology is in this sense anthropological like the Latin, or humanitarian like the Greek.

The one lowers God to man. "Thou thoughtest wickedly that I was such an One as thyself," it says. The other raises man

* Arnobius C. Gent. ii. 45-6.

to God: "We know that we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." The one tends to legitimise vengeance; the other brings in an infinite hope.

To the one reason and conscience are the most venerable authorities; to the other there is behind reason an arbitrary something not higher merely, but sometimes antagonistic, *i.e.*, which may affirm what conscience denies and deny what it affirms. Hence we may see why the Latin Church, thinking meanly of man naturally, laid stress on the Fall, while the Hellenists from their standpoint were led to dwell on the creation of humanity in the Divine image.

Milton is in harmony with Latinism in thus opening his poem: "Of man's first *disobedience*," for to the Latin Church, "Sin first, sin midst, and sin without end," is a favourite idea. In its theology sin is indelibly stamped on the universe, and a perpetuity of evil is certain. To the Hellenist, on the other hand, sin is not merely capable of extinction, but will actually be extinguished.

Two such theologies are, in fact, as wide apart as the Poles. *Paradise Lost* is the Latin thought, *Paradise Regained* the Hellenistic. The difference is illustrated in the creeds, the Nicene symbol ends with the words, "the life everlasting," and nothing further, the so-called Athanasian

symbol—which is really Latin—ends with “everlasting fire.”

The Hellenists cling to the thought of God’s nearness, His immanence; I do not say this is denied by the Latins, but the tendency is to regard God as distant, and our Lord as having literally gone far away. “To hear people speak, one would almost believe they were of opinion that God had withdrawn into silence since those old times, and that man was now placed on his own feet to see how he could get on without God.”* It is worth notice that the Greek term for our Lord’s coming again is *Parousia*, i.e., *presence*, which implies that He has never gone away. His return is like the Incarnation; hardly more than a manifestation of His abiding presence.

The Hellenists started from God, and asked, What is His nature? The Latins from man, and asked, Is he free? Filled with the thought of God, the Hellenist said, “It is enough,” “The battle is the Lord’s,” a conception which Browning re-echoes, “God’s in His heaven, all’s right with His world.”

It is of interest to note the working of these differing ideas in religious art. Look at the Christ of the Latin Church as He hangs on the Cross, not pained only, but with the sense of defeat in His expression—in the drooping head—in the weary,

* Göethe Conver. March 11, 1832.

half-closed eyes. The Latin Church never tires of this type, thus unconsciously proclaiming her belief to be *the failure of her Lord to save the world*. At the centre of her theology lies not merely the Crucified but the *Defeated One*.

Not a trace exists in the Latin Church to-day of the bright, radiant Christ, as we see Him in the Catacombs—a type borrowed, it may be, from the youthful Apollo, but certainly Hellenistic. Hardly ever will the Western Church repeat the figure of the majestic Christ of early Byzantine art as He sits triumphant.

And a Nemesis follows Latin devotion to this one side of our Lord's work. Fascinated by the Cross, to the exclusion of all else, the Western Church loses all sense of its genuine grandeur. Not merely has it in practice too often forgotten the Incarnation and the Resurrection in their true significance, but it has ceased to believe in that universal magnetism of the Cross, which is its real glory.

Follow these thoughts a moment further. Guided by a sure instinct which found expression in Augustine, many branches of the Latin Church rebelled against the idea, once universal, of a victorious Christ, who evangelises the spirits in prison, or, if the idea be retained, it is asserted less distinctly, till finally, as experience shows, it has practically disappeared from our

current creed. In the early Hellenists, on the contrary, it is not merely prominent, but many Fathers teach that *Christ absolutely emptied Hades of every prisoner.**

Further points remain to be noticed. We have already seen that the Hellenists thought God's so-called anger was a mode of cure, an artifice designed to heal. Not so, said the Latins, it is most real anger, and in fact it endures for ever. God is treating evil men medicinally; God is pouring out on them His stored-up vengeance. Such are the contrasted views. God is educating mankind, said the Hellenists. He is a Judge and Ruler, probing and testing men, said the Latins. Such were virtually the rival assertions. Oddly enough, the Almighty Sovereign of the Latin Church turns out in practice to be not really Almighty. He fails to realise His ideal in creation. Adam's failure in Paradise is followed by the second Adam's failure on Calvary. Whosoever is outside the ark, *i.e.* the Church, perishes, said the Latins. The very Flood that overwhelmed the sinful world was in effect a baptism, said the Hellenists.

Perhaps enough has been already noted

* Those who are interested in this subject of study may find many quotations from early writers in *Universalism Asserted*, p. 97-103. The whole literature of the Descent into Hades is at once curious and very little known.

as to the opposing Latin and Hellenistic teaching about Death, Resurrection and Judgment, pp. 57, 58, 59. Yet I may once more remind my readers how *vital* is the difference between regarding Death as penal or as remedial; between Resurrection viewed as re-uniting certain bodily atoms, or as communicating a spiritual life, as in its essence and always *redemptive*; between Judgment as the act of one who in judging ceases to be the Saviour; or as itself, too, part of Christ's great redeeming work.

Probably the issues raised by the awful question of moral evil afford the greatest test to which a theology can be subjected. Here, it will be said by many, is the weak side of Hellenism—it wants a due sense of Sin, *i.e.*, of its guilt.

This charge I desire to meet with absolute frankness. It is true that sin does not play so large a *rôle* in Hellenistic as in Latin theology, for sin is so prominent in Latinism as almost to overpower practically the sense of Redemption; for centuries Latin doctors taught, headed by Augustine, that a mere fraction of the race would be saved. To the Hellenist, on the contrary, the very blackness of sin is a proof that God cannot endure its presence for ever. Thus, because Redemption is the prominent fact in religion, sin does so far become less prominent in Hel-

lenistic thought; this may be admitted, but that this means an unduly light estimate of sin is a very different proposition, and one contradicted by many facts.

Indeed, looking further afield, we shall see much to confirm our disbelief that Optimism means indifference to sin—an assumption too often made. Beyond most if not all ancient creeds, the Jewish religion was marked by a sense of sin and of its taint, yet its penalties were temporary; its Psalms teem with invitations to all, and anticipations that all men would one day enter God's Kingdom.

Its Prophets are messengers of undying hope to all; the true burden of their thoughts is, "At evening time it shall be light." If there is a territory in Scripture less explored than any other it is the ample promises scattered over even the pages of the mournful Jeremiah and of Ezekiel, and no less of the minor Prophets—promises of restoration at the last to the most sinful, most impenitent, most God-defying and God-forsaken races, to Moab and Ammon, to Elam and Egypt, even to Sodom and Gomorrah.—*Ez. xvi. 53*.

There is hardly a Prophet in which this element of undying hope is not present, yet it is precisely this element that our divines as a rule ignore most persistently. Thus Psalmist and Prophet show us the lesson to which the Church of the West

still, as a rule, refuses to listen, viz., how a joyous Optimism may go hand in hand with a profound sense of sin and a profound belief in due retribution.

Mahometanism, on the contrary, which is hardly more than a distorted Mosaism, has at once lost the profound Jewish sense of sin, and has added an Eschatology black and sulphureous. The same conclusions we may draw from the ancient Creed of Persia—perhaps the noblest of non-Christian religions. In Zoroastrianism a pervading sense of the evil of sin exists, but balanced by a hopeful Eschatology. Ormuzd triumphs finally, and all pain and sin are swept away.

Of the great Hellenic philosophies, the two most spiritual and profound, Platonism and Stoicism, were optimistic in spirit. Clement of Alexandria, brightest and sunniest of teachers, has assuredly no less true a sense of sin than Tertullian, nor has Origen less than Augustine of this sense of human guilt. It was the great Apostle to whom sin became exceeding sinful, and who proclaimed himself the “chief of sinners,” who yet has most earnestly assured us that at the end God shall be “*All in All*,” who emphasizes the fact that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall “*All be made alive*.”

Thus it would seem clear that no necessary connection exists between a true

realisation of sin and a cruel Eschatology ; it is often the reverse ; it is sometimes hardly more than a question of race and temperament ; a cruel race develops a cruel faith.

But it is right to be explicit, and to say once for all that a sense of sin can be too prominent in theology, and can, *if so*, work untold mischief. It breeds misery and despair ; it paralyses effort in some cases, in others it leads to monstrous forms of asceticism. The shocking self-mutilations of Phenician worship were distinctly connected with a sense of sin and a desire to expiate it.* Self-mutilation, gross profligacy, odious cruelty that would not spare the tenderest age, such were the direct fruits of a strong if perverted sense of guilt and of the need of atonement.

Thus it is not the strength but the weakness of Western Christianity that its sense of sin is so profound as very often in practice to *overpower its sense of Redemption*. It was precisely because his conviction of guilt was stronger than his sense of Redemption that Judas went on from sin to sin, from treachery to suicide.

Nor have I yet said all that needs to be said. A pessimistic creed leads to still further evil in practice, for where a hopeless future is believed to await sin, unrepented here, it will be found that men

* Möv. Die Phon. i. 683.

break down moral safeguards and accept a delusive repentance at the last. Precisely to this are due the immoral distinctions and subtleties of Attrition and Contrition in the Roman Church. Precisely to this is due that immoral casuistry which seeks to attenuate the guilt of sin by drawing distinctions, that are too often imaginary, in order that grave offences may be classed as venial and thus escape hell.* Such Pessimism it was that led some of old to baptize notorious sinners, who declared their intention of continuing in sin, *e.g.*, which led Augustine to say that he would baptize those *living in adultery* if desperate at the last gasp.

A further charge brought against Hellenism is that it is a Philosophy rather than a Religion; it savours of Plato rather than of Christ.

Such charges have indeed a show of reason; the Hellenist would have thought it treason to Him who is Lord of the spirits of all flesh, to deny that His Spirit has been everywhere stirring the thoughts of men, everywhere pleading, everywhere teaching, everywhere and in all nations enlightening men. Because this is so the Hellenists gladly learned from the wise of all nations; they became debtors to all.

In fact, the gain to the Gospel from Philosophy is on the whole very great

* Maine's Antient Law.

indeed. The dogmatic system of Christianity was originated by its help, and the great verities of the Faith systematically stated and defended. It is this philosophic temper that gives to Hellenism its modernness of tone, and that *reasonableness*, which are invaluable at once in meeting scepticism on its own ground, and in carrying the standard of faith into the enemies' country, in confronting the scientific unbelief of the day. And note, at the same time, that the great Hellenists are *emphatically Christian*.

Those who have studied for themselves so typical a Hellenist as Origen know that in the whole range of the Fathers there was not one who more reverently studied the Scriptures, not one who more loyally accepted their every line and letter, as there certainly was not one who more faithfully exhibited their spirit in every act of that life of his, which may be best described as a ceaseless prayer.

Even at risk of repetition let me make quite clear, that indiscriminate eulogy of the Greek and indiscriminate censure of the Latin form no part of my programme.

Let us recognise fairly and fully the greatness of the Latins, while most resolute to dethrone their theology; let us admit the indispensable aid the Papal See brought to European development; let us admire Roman jurisprudence without

accepting the legal creed of the Roman Church; let us praise Rome's vigor, energy, capacity; let us admit that she possessed not a few qualities denied to her rival, and concede her superiority on certain great points.

Latin theology succeeded where Hellenism would have failed in mediæval times. In such ages Western Christianity needed the hardening alloy which Augustine largely supplied, and which was congenial to the race. Rome was a Pioneer, was forced to carry for its work a Pioneer's rough kit and rough tools. She had to travel over the miriest and roughest paths; she was forced to ride roughshod, to carry axe and hammer—nay, to wield at times a bludgeon. Like the old Hebrews, she cursed freely, but her blessings were no less fervent, and her prayers, if sometimes ill-directed, were frequent.

She was always vigorous, practical, and knew when to yield as well as when to insist. She transposed the Gospel story "into a lower key and accentuated the sharps," but she had to speak to barbarians, and something barbarian was needed if her message was to be "understood of the people."

Her theorisings about salvation were harsh, her ideas of unity were crude, her rule despotic, she fostered asceticism. But

in her very asceticism the practical spirit of the West asserted itself, and while Eastern Recluses were sunk in idle dreams or mounted tall pillars, their Western brethren drained swamps, cut down forests, and built bridges.

Asceticism, indeed, in such an age was a necessary corrective to Imperialism; for Monasticism encourages Individualism, and that in two ways: (*a*) not only were the great abbeys resolute in asserting their independence of external control; (*b*) but they in practice gave to individuals a freedom elsewhere unattainable in such times. A Kempis in his cell forgets the Church, forgets the hierarchy, forgets the Papacy; thinks of the presence of God and of His Christ and of these only, and so his words have the freshness and the force that come from direct contact of the individual spirit with God.

Every abuse of mediævalism had its germ of truth, *e.g.*, the very cult of the Saints and of the Blessed Virgin contained an affirmation of a deep verity, viz., that humanity is in its essence divine. In the West, for reasons already stated, was this affirmation specially needed. Here, too, we notice a fortunate inconsistency, when we remember that this emphatic assertion of the divine in man was made in a society where men and women were

treated as chattels, where slavery was universal.*

That the Roman Church succeeded in the Middle Ages because, on the whole, she deserved success has been said. It is not really a paradox or a contradiction to repeat here that while Hellenism was comparatively shortlived, in part at least, *because of her merits* (because too liberal, too little centralised), Latinism succeeded in part *because of her faults*.

But the faults that were almost merits in mediæval times are now survivals of the unfit, if not of the unfittest. If we would repel unbelief and commend the Gospel to the thoughtful, we must retrace our steps. The Western Church must, at the least, abandon the eternal *non possumus* which bars Reform, which leaves the many noble elements in her system like those nuns who are called "*sepolte vive*," alive indeed, but buried.

It is the fashion to credit Rome with extraordinary acuteness. Far and near has this strange delusion spread. The facts of history tell a very different tale. I know not where any power can be found

* And it may perhaps be said that as the suppression of Reason by Western theology led to a system of Rationalism, so Latinism, building on a low view of man as hell-deserving, found its Nemesis in the growth of a vast hierarchy of Saints, in a mass of cults—in the elevation to divine or quasi-divine rank of a crowd of beings who were merely human.

that has *blundered so often and so persistently as Rome*. Her earlier successes so blinded her rulers, that since mediæval times they have added blunder to blunder with a magnificent disregard of consequences.

Absolute mistress of Europe for centuries, controlling all destinies, supreme in every school and university, thundering from every pulpit—what is Rome to-day? She has wasted a magnificent estate, her Catholicity is in ruins, her empire rent in twain, her prestige lowered, her writs hardly run outside the Latin races, and imperfectly even there.

In the division of Europe, which her blind refusal to reform caused, she has retained the sceptical and decadent Frenchman, whose light literature is the foulest known to any (Christian?) race; the retrograde Spaniard; the half-exhausted Italian, the shiftless Pole.

At the supreme moment of her destiny in the sixteenth century, Rome, like a foolish virgin, was asleep; and when she awoke it was too late; nearly half Europe, geographically, and far more than half Europe, progressively and intellectually, was for ever lost.

Rome has anathematised modern thought, only to find it grow each day stronger, till her curses now hardly provoke a smile from any serious opponent.

She has recently surrounded herself with the halo of infallibility, an act which recalls the words of a charming authoress,* who says that she now lived "in a house far more splendid than any she had ever inhabited, as *commonly happens to people whose fortunes are declining.*"

"The stars of Heaven in their courses fought against Sisera"; it would seem as if the stars of Heaven were fighting *versus* Roman Christianity. The tide of empire is rapidly flowing West, and inevitably tending to place the balance of power in hands unfriendly to the Papacy in a new hemisphere where all the conditions—social, intellectual, spiritual—are adverse to Roman claims.

Nor is this all. In Europe, Russia, the youngest and strongest of the nations, and growing rapidly, stands confronting Rome, and denying her claims; ready to meet her with her favourite weapons of pomp and ritual, and dogma, and ordered hierarchy; and with a weapon which Rome has always feared—the *appeal to history*.

"*How are the mighty fallen,*" is a saying that rises to the lips, as we contemplate, in the calm light of history, the present position and the probable future of the Papacy. There is something almost pathetic in the half-wistful appeal of the Pope for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon.

* Miss Mitford.

It is an almost audible confession of failure, of deep apprehension, but ill concealed by the assumption of infallibility.

The qualities that carried the Papacy through the Middle Ages are rapidly growing out of date, when ignorance was general, when the "stone-hard" Latin race set its face as a flint, when its rival's empire in the East seemed writ in water.

We may see—at least, our children may—the old saw verified, *Dura tamen molli saxa cavantur aqua*, that water eats away the hardest stone. We may see the final triumph over Latin absolutism and cruelty, of those undying principles which were, and continue to be, the strength of Hellenism, for they have the promise of the age to come.

I have fully admitted that these pages contain not a finished picture, but a sketch of a great subject. But even such an outline as has been given would be imperfect were I not to attempt a brief answer to a question which an intelligent reader is certain to ask—viz., Why this fair structure of Early Hellenism proved so evanescent? Such answer as I can give has been already hinted at, and may here be set down a little more fully.

As a preliminary remark, it may be pointed out that in Hellenism there is a certain indefiniteness as compared with its rival. An illustration of this may be

found if one compares the Alexandrian Clement with Tertullian. It is in a real sense "of the spirit," rather than "of the letter." Sometimes it is not easy to reduce its teachings to formal propositions, or to lay down its boundaries exactly on the ecclesiastical map. Perhaps in this fact lay an initial weakness, one reason of its early decline and fall.

But the true cause lay deeper. If Rome's faults were in the past a source of strength, so were many of her sister's excellencies a cause of weakness, and finally of death. Hellenism was, in fact, as one born out of due time. It stood at a level not possible to maintain in the Byzantine Empire, and maintained only with extreme difficulty and by help of some chosen intellects, in the earlier centuries, at Alexandria, at Antioch, at Cappadocia, and at Cesarea. The real difficulty is *not* the dying out of Optimism in the early Church, it is *rather the genesis of the Hellenistic theology* in an atmosphere so foul and cruel as that of the pagan world in the centuries immediately succeeding Christ's birth.

With minds saturated and, I may add, warped by Latin traditions, we are apt to lose sight of certain facts of great moment. We forget the significance of the rise of the Hellenistic movement in

theology; the remarkable splendor and dignity of its thought; the no less remarkable essential unity of so many varying Hellenistic thinkers, in so many varying schools, at varying epochs.

I. Let us consider these briefly. The Church was born into a world of whose moral rottenness it is difficult to form an adequate idea. The rise of optimism would be wonderful enough in such an environment. But there is more to be said if we would duly gauge the significance of such a theology at such a time. We have to remember that the Church was then engaged in a struggle for life or death with cruel foes. Now the proclamation that the bitterest enemy of the faith would, sooner or later, be saved, must have *seemed* very like an act of treason to the Church. Such a proclamation would have *seemed* to say, "Why, if salvation be in any event assured, should I become a Christian?" It is only a robust and profound conviction that this message of salvation expresses the very *essence* of the Gospel that can, I think, account for the theology of Alexandria. ii. Whether the Alexandrian speculations be true or false, yet the very magnificence of the spiritual temple, which men like Clement and Origen reared amid the sad discords and woes of the age, cannot fail to stir our sympathies. It is very suggestive to

remember that this wonderful conception of the entire spiritual universe—*everywhere* to the remotest limits of space—with its “stairway of worlds,” as the theatre of redemption, and as bound by a golden chain to the very throne of God, should have been the earliest and most spontaneous attempt at a theology of the Gospel. iii. A third fact remains. This, namely, that for centuries similar conceptions were “*the ruling ideas*” of all Hellenistic theologians. We have to account not for the enthusiasm of an isolated thinker, or even of a group of thinkers, but *practically* for all the Hellenistic schools. (This has been adverted to on an earlier page, and is noticed here only to make the argument complete.)

It will, I think, at any rate be clear that a theology so coloured by optimism must have had great and increasing difficulties in maintaining itself in the moral atmosphere then prevailing, as we shall see. Soon the temptation to appeal to man’s *fears* became almost irresistible. The decay of early Hellenism was, we might almost say, inevitable. And those who read attentively the Homilies of St. Chrysostom—can actually watch the process of disintegration at work—can see how the preacher tends steadily to stem the tide of moral evil by appeals to

terrorism, while his strong personal leaning to optimism is no less clear.

Further, we must remember that the forces of Hellenism were scattered, its organisation looser than that of its rival; it lacked the staying power of the Roman, it lacked the tough Latin fibre. The Church of the East suffered from an *embarras de richesses*; instead of one city, Rome, towering above the rest, it had three rival cities—Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople. It had too many leaders, of whom not one was absolutely supreme—like Augustine, whose supremacy was unchallenged. Athanasius' great powers were absorbed in a single controversy. Origen's fame was tarnished by a calumny; so was that of the most famous and original of the Antiochenes, Theodore of Mopsuestia. It is as though the story of ancient Greece, vanquished by Rome, repeated itself in Hellenistic theology.

So it fell out that, as in actual warfare a single army under a single head is usually too strong for more numerous forces if divided, if mutually jealous and loosely organised, that the Eastern Church proved less stable than the Western, the First became Last and the Last First.

To this result yet another cause contributed: in the fourth and succeeding centuries the outlook for the Italian peninsula and Europe generally seemed

of the darkest, as successive waves of barbarism poured in. But "out of the eater came forth meat," out of the rude invader was slowly developed the German, the Frenchman, the Englishman — by mixture, by law, by Christianisation.

The decomposing elements furnished fresh soil fitted to receive Rome's vigorous, if hard, creed. And when weakened by vices and broken down by the long schism, when Popes excommunicated rival Popes, Papalism could not resist the reforming movement; there remained strength enough in Western Christianity on the one hand to reorganise her forces, and on the other to give birth to fresh and living communities fashioned on varying Christian models, but Latin at heart.

Far different was the lot of the Eastern Church. The splendours of the fourth century—the ecclesiastical triumphs of that age were to a large extent delusive. They concealed profound dangers just as the splendid era of the fourteenth Louis concealed the real weakness of the Monarchy in France. Behind the magnificent literature, behind the rapid extension of the Church, beneath its manifold glories and seeming vitality lay profound abysses. The Church was in danger of perishing from over-success; a mass of half-Christianised Pagans swarmed into her fold; vice and luxury made their homes

in the greater cities, while the remedies applied did hardly more than aggravate the disorder; for the main remedy was an increased asceticism, and Western asceticism is mild and reasonable compared with its Eastern sister.

With asceticism came fresh fanaticism and an increased terrorism. Extravagant and interminable controversies on highly speculative points attracted the Eastern mind, and turned its energies into barren channels. Separatist tendencies of racial origin asserted themselves; intrigue and bribery and forgeries were favourite weapons to overwhelm a rival, or propagate a doctrine. The line of great teachers had died out; no successor to the Basils and Gregories had appeared. It seemed as if the Eastern Church had exhausted its powers in the production of an Origen and an Athanasius and their immediate successors, as if too early and too splendid a maturity had been followed by an early decline.

In such surroundings, under such an environment, the old Hellenistic basis of theology was inevitably, if by slow and steady degrees, abandoned. We need not wonder that ultimately the bright Optimism that had been so conspicuous in primitive Hellenism died out, that the Eastern Church accepted a virtual Pessimism which to this day marks her teaching.

Nor is this all. Before the enfeebled Eastern Church of the fifth and sixth century lay a task harder far than was assigned to the West—to penetrate the arid wastes and barren steppes of Asia was itself a vast undertaking, but even then its task was only begun. The Eastern Church was confronted, not with the comparatively narrow limits of Europe and its rude tribes, but with the vast expanses of Asia, and with ancient and highly-organised religions in Persia, in India, and in China, and with the stern militant creed of Mahomet in the vigour of early maturity.

Nor does this exhaust the disadvantages of the Eastern Church. She had allotted to her at once the more difficult task, and yet far less of motive power. At the centre of Oriental Christianity, in place of the vigorous Papal Court with its singleness of aim, was the corrupt Byzantine rule, a city torn by factions and not hallowed by any Apostolic memories; where absentee Bishops hung about the Court, poisoning the atmosphere with intrigues; while at Alexandria wild monks swarmed in from the Egyptian or Syrian deserts with a message too often of bloodshed and a Gospel of violence and blows.

So low did the Church of Origen and and Athanasius fall, to such alliances did

she stoop—to her we may fitly address the Latin poet's enquiry: *Hectoris Andromache, Pyrrhine connubia servas ?*

On such a state of things generally existing, for we have no right to suppose Byzantium worse than Antioch or Alexandria, the Arms of Islam supervened, and the Gospel was all but extinguished in its earliest home. Thus I have attempted, with what success let my readers say, to explain the downfall of the early Hellenistic theology from its pride of place.

* * * *

Meantime, Rome, sheltered behind the Eastern Church as a rampart, lost only North Africa and most of Spain (the latter temporarily) to the arms of Islam; while its own zeal and devotion were stimulated by the exertion needed to win to her fold the various Teutonic tribes that had submerged Europe. Thus it fell out that the storms which shattered Rome politically, fostered Rome ecclesiastically, and promoted her rapid growth.

Doubtless the Latin Church sank at times to awful depths, but she had always a greater recuperative power than the Hellenistic. Better led, better placed, better ruled, she was able to right herself and start afresh. Whatever, too, may be our opinion of the great Scholastic movement, it is at least a proof of two

things. It proves how vast were the reserves of intellectual vigour in the West, and how completely they were placed at the disposal of the Church.

Two names in the Gospel story present themselves, as we think of the sister churches of the East and West; the busy, practical, Latin type recalls Martha; the gentler and more contemplative Hellenism reminds us of Mary. True, Hellenism left her first love, and fell on evil days; till now the old spirit seems almost dead in its birthplace. Yet the Greeks have never formally rejected that teaching which made Alexandria famous, which, beneath differences of thought, was the true inspiration of Antioch, of Cesarea, of the Cappadocian Teachers.

They have never thought of disavowing such as Gregory of Nyssa, or Clement of Alexandria, with their outspoken and joyous optimism. They have never given up their past by any irrevocable act. Therefore, if Hellenism has greatly fallen, it has still the future. "Her sins, which are many, shall be forgiven her, for she hath loved much."

* * * *

History repeats itself; in the middle of the fifteenth century, when Constantinople fell, there came, as it were, a renewal of the old rivalry of Hellene and Latin, when Greek culture and learning once

more took refuge on Latin soil. At first the successes of the Neo-Hellenism were rather artistic and intellectual than religious, but soon its influence passed into theology. The New Testament became a power, its study revived. The Greek Fathers were edited; a silent and, at first, imperceptible shock was given to the dominant Augustinianism of the age. Hellenism, awaking from its sleep of centuries, introduced a new force into European thought—a leaven whose influence we are feeling to-day.

With it came a certain sense of freedom which is typically Greek, of bonds relaxed, of new activities, new possibilities, new hope for humanity; nor was it possible that such a force should not in the long run profoundly modify religious thought, even though its working was at first slow and indirect.

* * * *

To-day Hellenistic theology is knocking more loudly than ever at the door of the Western Church, and is more than ever bent on effecting an entrance. True, it is not the Hellenes who in person are leading the attack; it is, in fact, the Teuton (the English and the Germans), who are attacking the fortress of Western theology with weapons largely forged in the great Hellenistic schools, with doctrines often

derided as novelties, but in fact reversions to an earlier type.

The word Teuton is fateful; in the early Christian centuries Teutonic tribes crushed Imperial Rome; in the sixteenth century a Teutonic movement inflicted on ecclesiastical Rome a deadly wound. It seems as if we to-day were destined to see the attack renewed, as if Teutonic theology, catching its inspiration from Hellenistic sources, were destined to lead yet another attack, not indeed on Rome directly, but on that Latin rendering of the Gospel of which Carthage was in a special sense the parent, which Rome endorsed, and to which in spirit not Rome merely, but the whole West, has clung.

* * * *

A few words as I close. I can hardly tell whether I feel more deeply the need there is that some such book as this should be written, or the imperfect way in which I have carried out my task.

Should these brief pages not succeed, then I trust that some abler champion will be found who shall be successful in pressing home this great truth, that Latinism in any of its forms cannot claim to be the sole, or even the earliest, rendering of Christianity.

CATHOLIC, EVANGELICAL, RATIONAL—

these are noble epithets. Why must they be always so vainly opposed one to the other in our current systems of theology? Why should we not once for all agree to unite them?

I have attempted to show how very close the connection is between racial instincts in Latin and Hellene and their theology—to point out how, in many ways, a true continuity exists between pre-Christian and Christian Ideals and Beliefs in both cases. Thus to learn the pedigree of our creeds is indeed for all thoughtful men a necessary condition of any true grasp of the religious questions of the day.

Finally, for that large and increasing class who feel the impossibility of accepting a pessimistic creed as a true rendering of Christianity, I have written these pages in the hope that a way of escape will be opened for many, when they learn that an earlier and broader version of the Gospel exists than any which bears a Latin *imprimatur*; that it is possible to be Catholic and Orthodox in the best sense, and, if any so please, Universalist, while rejecting not merely the claims of Rome, but that harsh and loveless theology which the “stone-hard” Latin race forged—a yoke which, if our fathers were able to bear, has for very many of us become an impossible burden.

LONDON:
W. SPEAIGHT AND SONS, PRINTERS,
FETTER LANE, E.C.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

UNIVERSALISM ASSERTED AS THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL.

7th Edition. Cloth, 2s. 8d. net; Paper Covers, 1s. 6d. net.

With Preface by Edna Lyall.

May be had from Messrs. Williams and Norgate (Publishers), or from the Author, Donnington Rectory, Leabury.

The following wholly unsolicited letter was addressed by Canon Wilberforce to the Author:—

THE DEANERY, SOUTHAMPTON,
AUGUST 6, 1890.

My Dear Sir,

"I am deeply grateful to you for your noble book, 'Universalism Asserted.' I am *greatly* indebted to it, not only for the inspiration, but even for the very thoughts in some instances, of the two Sermons enclosed. It is the very best compendium of the glorious truth of modern times.

"May Our Father continue to send you forth to vindicate His character against the slander of Atheists on the one hand, and Conventionalists on the other.

I am, faithfully, &c.,

BASIL WILBERFORCE."

**Editions have appeared of the book in
Japanese and in Swedish.**

A few Press Notices are appended.

"Certainly a full, interesting, and vigorous book. We commend it warmly."—*Literary World*.

"A masterly compendium of facts and arguments.—Eternal Punishment."—*G. F. Aked*.

"The ablest Universalist book of English authorship."
—*Christian Leader* (Boston, U.S.A.).

"The most valuable book thus far produced on this

side of the Atlantic in defence of the ancient faith of the Christian Church."

—*The Universalist (Chicago, U.S.A.).*

"The ablest and most convincing assertion of Universalism we have yet met with."—*Words of Reconciliation.*

"Let me thank you heartily for your really magnificent book. The reasoning is perfect and convincing. The patristic evidence is admirably just, the Scriptural texts alone suffice. The whole work is a noble act, so to speak. It will pass through many editions and do its work. The style is admirably adapted to its purpose."

—*The late Rev. Archer Gurney.*

"A remarkable volume, which must attract attention."

—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

Redemption : Its True Extent and Complete Success.

LAWRENCE, HIGH ST., WESTON-SUPER-MARE. 6d.

Larger Hope Leaflets.

Nos. I. to IV.

BT

22

.A43

Allin, Thomas

Race and religion...

I28512

MAR 1

33

Rosa Page Welch

Karl H. Himmelfarb

Dianne Heath

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 424 682

BT22
.A43

128512

BT

22

A 43

Allin, Thomas.

Race and religion.

128512

AUG 30

Bindery

SEP 5

MAR 1 38

MAR 1

Rosa Page Welch
3402 1/2 Giles

NOV 4

1954

Paul Hillmeister

NOV

McCormick Seminary

FEB 22

Dianne Heath

5825 Woodlawn, 1316

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 424 682

BT22 128512
.A43

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



48 424 682